

THEOLOGICAL
EDUCATOR

1.6.92

Library of the Theological Seminary.

PRINCETON, N. J.

Division BS1171

Section W94

Number 1891

Shelf

La net
F B

THE
THEOLOGICAL EDUCATOR.

Edited by the
REV. W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.,
Editor of the "Expositor."

DR. CHARLES H. H. WRIGHT'S
INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT.

NEW YORK:
THOMAS WHITTAKER,
2 AND 3, BIBLE HOUSE.

AN
INTRODUCTION TO THE
OLD TESTAMENT.

BY THE REV.
CHARLES H. H. WRIGHT, D.D., PH.D.,
BAMPTON LECTURER (1878) IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,
DONNELLAN LECTURER (1880-81) UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN,
EXAMINER IN HEBREW AND NEW TESTAMENT GREEK IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.

[Theo. Educator.]

SECOND EDITION—REVISED.

NEW YORK:
THOMAS WHITTAKER,
2 AND 3, BIBLE HOUSE.

P R E F A C E.

THE manual of Introduction to the Old Testament now presented to the English student endeavours to give the ascertained results of modern criticism, as far as is possible within very confined limits. The lists of works, English and foreign, appended under each heading, point out the sources where fuller information can be obtained, and may, perhaps, stir up some to take a deeper interest in Biblical studies.

Those lists do not pretend to be exhaustive. Among the books of special importance to the Biblical student is the *Bibliotheca Rabbinica* of Dr. August Wünsche, being a German translation of the entire *Midrash Rabbah*, etc., with notes, which has opened up that rich treasury of myth, legend, and parable to a wider circle of readers. Those ancient Midrashim, notwithstanding many short-comings and mistakes, afford much information to the student of the Old Testament.

The *Bibliotheca Rabbinica* has been published in parts from 1880-1885, and contains the Midrash on Genesis (pp. 558), on Exodus (pp. 408), Leviticus

(pp. 298), Numbers (pp. 676), Deuteronomy (pp. 184), besides the Megilloth, Esther (pp. 102), Ruth (pp. 98), Lamentations (pp. 176), Koheleth (pp. 165), Song of Songs (pp. 208), the Pesikta of Rab Kahana (pp. 300), and the Midrash on Proverbs (pp. 76). These numbers include the Notes, but not the Introductions. The extent and importance of the work is thus apparent.

In England besides the *Speaker's Commentary* and the *Pulpit Commentary*, much new work has been done. The Bishop of Gloucester's *Old Testament Commentary for English Readers*, 5 vols., royal 8vo, especially on the Prophets, is worthy of the attention of scholars, though not referred to in our pages. Bishop Wordsworth's *Holy Bible with Notes and Introductions* will often repay a reference. Dr. Joseph Parker's *People's Bible*—vols. i.-xiii. already published, including *Genesis* to *Proverbs* (Hodder & Stoughton)—is not critical, though often highly suggestive. Nisbet's series of *Men of the Bible* has been occasionally referred to, and might have been referred to throughout. The Religious Tract Society's scholarly series of *By-paths of Bible Knowledge* has brought recondite information to almost every door. The *Records of the Past*, or the English translations of the Assyrian and Egyptian monuments, edited by S. Birch, LL.D., vols. i.-xii., ought to be more known; and the new series, edited by Professor Sayce, of which four volumes have already appeared,

promises still better things. The *Porta Linguarum Orientalium*, edited by J. H. Petermann and H. L. Strack, deserves more attention than might appear from the casual references made to it in these pages. It embraces two volumes of Assyrian grammar and chrestomathy by Friedr. Delitzsch, 1889, and an Ethiopic grammar and chrestomathy by Prätorius. Gustav Dalman is writing in the same series a grammar, with chrestomathy, of the Palestinian Talmud. The publications of the Palestine Exploration Fund are in many ways valuable, as well as the works of the German Society established for the same purpose. Especially useful is *Names and Places in the Old Testament and Apocrypha*, 1887, issued by the Palestine Exploration Fund. Schürer's massive *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 2nd ed., 1886, 1889, 1890, cannot be dispensed with. T. and T. Clark have begun the publication of an English translation. Nor must Hatch's *Essays in Biblical Greek*, 1889, be forgotten.

The problems connected with the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament are numerous and intricate. Although so much has been effected in modern times, the field of research cannot yet be considered exhausted. Discoveries in the departments of Assyriology and Egyptology have done much to elucidate the meaning of many passages of Holy Writ, but they have sometimes brought to light new difficulties. Those discoveries are even now

only in their infancy, and much has yet to be accomplished by the aid of the spade and pickaxe in Palestine and Egypt, and elsewhere, ere we can regard many Old Testament questions as finally settled.

In every field of scientific investigation hypotheses have been found necessary in order to group together known facts, and to lead onward to new discoveries. Theories which have proved ultimately to be erroneous have yet frequently been productive of great results. The earnest seeker after truth in the department of Biblical research ought, therefore, to be tolerant of speculations, even when opposed to his holiest sentiments and convictions. No theory of modern days has created more repugnance among orthodox expositors than the Graf-Wellhausen theory of the composition of the Pentateuch. And yet it is well to observe that even the strongest defenders of that theory, while insisting on the very late compilation of the Pentateuch, maintain that the substance of many of its narratives and laws was in existence at a far earlier date. The theory does not necessarily make the Pentateuch a mere fabrication of designing priests, as is sometimes affirmed. In setting forth the consequences of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis, this ought to be borne in mind.

The Old Testament Scriptures have, alas! been treated by many critics with an irreverence which cannot be too strongly condemned. On the other

hand, it must not be forgotten that opinions branded as irreverent and dangerous in one age, have sometimes been unanimously accepted in another. The dangers predicted by timid theologians have often proved to be unreal. Instances of this fact will be found mentioned in the following pages. When, however, we consider the reverence due to the Scriptures as the channel of Divine revelation, one cannot wonder at such fears. The antagonists of "faith" have often exultingly cried, like the children of Edom in the day of Jerusalem (Ps. cxxxvii. 7), "Rase it, rase it, even to the foundation thereof." But the shout has not been one of victory, like that of the children of Israel before the walls of Jericho. The Bible still firmly holds its place as "the Book of Books" even at the close of the nineteenth century. New generations of sceptics continue, no doubt, to predict the coming "eclipse of faith," but are destined to prove in due time "false prophets," like those before them.

A recent author has shown that the introduction of law into the phenomena of the spiritual world is free from many of the dangers which seemed likely to beset such an attempt. The assertion of modern criticism is that the phenomena which characterise the literatures of other nations are to be found in the Old Testament books. But even should the assertion prove true, the fact (when rightly understood) will not lessen the reverence for the Sacred Scriptures.

Those writings are in many aspects wholly unique. They have, however, a human side as well as a Divine. The Divine and the human element meet together in the written Word, as well as in “the Word made flesh.”

The Synagogue and the Church have rightly maintained that the Old Testament Scriptures are the work of Divinely-inspired men. There are certain landmarks which no flood of advancing criticism will ever sweep away:—

“The floods have lifted up, Jehovah !
The floods have lifted up their voice ;
The floods lift up their waves.
Above the voices of many waters,
The mighty breakers of the sea,
Jehovah on high is mighty.
Thy testimonies are very sure :
Holiness becometh Thine house,
Jehovah ! for evermore.”—Ps. xciii. 3-5.

The conclusion of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews remains as true as ever: “God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in His Son.”

In issuing a new book on the Old Testament, I am painfully reminded of the loss of some friends who assisted me by their kindly aid and counsel in former works. Professor Franz Delitzsch’s death, on March 3rd, 1890, put an end to a warm friendship of over twenty-five years, and has left a blank

which will long be felt in the ranks of Old Testament expositors. His profound scholarship and earnest piety need no more than a passing reference. The death, May 22nd, 1889, of Dr. William Wright, Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge, who was universally acknowledged as in the foremost rank of Semitic scholars, has closed an unbroken friendship of considerably more than thirty years, which began when I was his pupil in Trinity College, Dublin. The loss of two such eminent scholars will long be regretted. The *Lectures on the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages* of Professor William Wright, just published under the able editorship of Professor W. Robertson Smith, his successor in the Cambridge chair, are a contribution of great importance to the Biblical student.

I was not aware until after this manual had been sent to press that the Rev. S. R. Driver, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, had undertaken a work of the same character, though considerably more extensive in its aims. Professor Driver's work is in the press, and will be published in the early part of next year. The same able Hebraist is taking part in a new Hebrew-English Lexicon, based on the latest editions of Gesenius by Mühlau and Volck. The plan of the work is due to two eminent American scholars, Professors Dr. C. A. Briggs, and Dr. Brown of the Union Theological Seminary, New York, the latter

being chief editor. The work is now in the press, and when published will supply a desideratum long needed by English students of Hebrew.

In conclusion, I must acknowledge my obligations to the Rev. T. K. Abbott, B.D., F.T.C.D., Librarian and Professor of Hebrew in the University of Dublin; and to Mr. Spurrell, M.A., my co-Examiner in Hebrew and New Testament Greek in the University of London, who have most kindly assisted me both in the reading of the proof sheets of this little work, and by suggestions which have been duly embodied in its pages.

33, MESPIL ROAD, DUBLIN,

November 5th, 1890.

PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION.

A SECOND edition having been called for within five months, the work has been carefully revised, and improvements suggested by well-known scholars introduced throughout. More could not at present be attempted. Special attention, however, is directed to the Appendix, which supplements and explains several points noticed in the book.

DUBLIN, *June 6th, 1891.*

C O N T E N T S .

PART I.

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	HISTORICAL SKETCH OF INTRODUCTIONS TO THE OLD TESTAMENT	1
II.	THE PRINTED HEBREW EDITIONS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT	10
III.	THE STATE OF THE HEBREW TEXT, AND THE HEBREW MSS.	14
IV.	HISTORY OF THE HEBREW PUNCTUATION, HEBREW GRAMMARS, LEXICONS, ETC.	23
V.	THE JEWISH MASSORAH	31
VI.	THE TARGUMS, ARAMAIC TEXTS, GRAMMARS, ETC.	40
VII.	THE SYRIAC VERSIONS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, SYRIAC TEXTS, GRAMMARS, ETC.	49
VIII.	THE GREEK VERSIONS	53
IX.	THE ANCIENT LATIN VERSIONS	64

PART II. THE BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THE PENTATEUCH :—

X.	THE PENTATEUCH IN GENERAL	70
XI.	SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF PENTATEUCH CRITICISM	85
	THE LITERATURE OF THAT SUBJECT	101
	LITERATURE ON THE PENTATEUCH	102
XII.	THE SEVERAL BOOKS OF THE PENTATEUCH :—	
§ 1.	GENESIS	105
	LITERATURE	107
§ 2.	EXODUS	109
	LITERATURE	110
§ 3.	LEVITICUS	111
	LITERATURE	112

THE SEVERAL BOOKS OF THE PENTATEUCH—*continued.*

CHAP.		PAGE
§ 4. NUMBERS		112
LITERATURE		114
§ 5. DEUTERONOMY		114
LITERATURE		116

XIII. THE HISTORICAL BOOKS :—

§ 1. THE BOOK OF JOSHUA		118
LITERATURE		120
SAMARITAN CHRONICLE		121
§ 2. THE BOOK OF JUDGES		122
LITERATURE		125
§ 3. THE BOOK OF RUTH		126
LITERATURE		126
§ 4. THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL		127
LITERATURE		129
§ 5. THE BOOKS OF THE KINGS		130
LITERATURE		132
§ 6. THE BOOKS OF THE CHRONICLES		132
LITERATURE		136
§ 7. THE BOOKS OF EZRA AND NEHEMIAH		137
LITERATURE		139
§ 8. THE BOOK OF ESTHER		140
OMISSION OF THE NAME OF GOD IN THE BOOK		141
APOCRYPHAL ADDITIONS		144
LITERATURE		146

XIV. THE POETICAL BOOKS :—

§ 1. THE BOOK OF JOB		147
SUBJECT OF BOOK		149
CRITICAL QUESTIONS		150
LITERATURE		151
§ 2. THE BOOK OF PSALMS		152
NAME AND DIVISION		153
NUMBER OF PSALMS		156
SUPERSCRIPTIONS AND AUTHORSHIP		157
LITERATURE		158

CONTENTS.

THE POETICAL BOOKS—*continued.*

CHAP.		PAGE
§ 3. THE BOOK OF PROVERBS:—		
NAME AND CONTENTS		160
AUTHORSHIP		162
LITERATURE		163
§ 4. THE BOOK OF KOHELETH OR ECCLESIASTES:—		
NAME, AUTHORSHIP, AND CONTENTS		164
LITERATURE		167
§ 5. THE SONG OF SONGS:—		
AUTHORSHIP AND CONTENTS		168
LITERATURE		171
XV. THE PROPHETS:—		
§ 1. ON THE PROPHETS IN GENERAL:—		
LITERATURE		173
<i>A. The Four Greater Prophets.</i>		
§ 2. THE BOOK OF ISAIAH:—		
CONTENTS AND AUTHORSHIP		175
FIRST PORTION		175
SECOND PORTION		178
LITERATURE		180
§ 3. THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH		182
CONTENTS AND AUTHORSHIP		183
LITERATURE		185
§ 4. THE BOOK OF LAMENTATIONS		186
LITERATURE		187
§ 5. THE BOOK OF EZEKIEL		187
CONTENTS AND AUTHORSHIP		188
PECULIARITIES OF THE BOOK		189
LITERATURE		191
§ 6. THE BOOK OF DANIEL:—		
HISTORY AND LEGENDS OF DANIEL		191
CONTENTS OF THE BOOK		192
REFERENCES TO THE BOOK		194
APOCRYPHAL ADDITIONS		197
LITERATURE		197
XVI. B. The Twelve Minor Prophets.		
LITERATURE		199

a. The Nine Pre-exilian.

CHAP		PAGE
§ 1. HOSEA		200
CONTENTS AND DATE		201
LITERATURE		202
§ 2. THE BOOK OF JOEL		202
CONTENTS AND STYLE		203
LITERATURE		204
§ 3. THE BOOK OF AMOS :—		
CONTENTS		205
LITERATURE		205
§ 4. THE BOOK OF OBADIAH :—		
NAME AND CONTENTS		206
LITERATURE		207
§ 5. THE BOOK OF JONAH		207
HISTORY OR ALLEGORY		208
LITERATURE		212
§ 6. THE BOOK OF MICAH :—		
CONTENTS AND AUTHORSHIP		213
LITERATURE		215
§ 7. THE BOOK OF NAHUM		215
LITERATURE		216
§ 8. THE BOOK OF HABAKKUK		216
LITERATURE		217
§ 9. THE BOOK OF ZEPHANIAH		218
LITERATURE		219

b. The Three Post-exilian.

§ 10. THE BOOK OF HAGGAT		219
LITERATURE		220
§ 11. THE BOOK OF ZECHARIAH :—		
THE FIRST PART		221
THE SECOND PART		222
LITERATURE		224
§ 12. THE BOOK OF MALACHI		225
LITERATURE		226
APPENDIX		227

PART I.

CHAPTER I.

HISTORICAL SKETCH OF INTRODUCTIONS.

1. “INTRODUCTIONS” to the Old and New Testament Scriptures are of comparatively recent growth. The monk Adrian wrote in the fifth century an *εἰσαγωγὴ εἰς τὰς θείας γραφάς*, but it contained little of what would now be comprehended under the title. See Ad. Merx, *Eine Rede vom Auslegen ins besondere des A. T.*, 1879. The *Instituta regularia divinæ legis*, by Junilius (died 552), quæstor of the Holy Palace in Constantinople, contains in its first part a general introduction to the Holy Scriptures. The work of Cassiodorius, senator, *De institutione divinarum litterarum*, written shortly after, contains much which would even now be comprehended under the name of an “Introduction.” “Introductions” were, however, almost unknown in the Middle Ages.

2. The Reformation of the sixteenth century gave an impetus to Biblical studies of all kinds. The scholars of that period in general discussed questions connected with the Bible in the light of the con-

troversy then raging as to the authority of Holy Scripture and that of the Church, and the non-canonicity of the Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament.

The theologians of the sixteenth century derived their knowledge of Hebrew and Old Testament literature mainly from Jewish sources. Elias Levita, the greatest Jewish scholar of the age (born 1474, died 1549), was the main link by which the Christian scholars of that age were connected with the Jews of the preceding ages. J. Reuchlin (born 1454, and died 1521), the first Hebrew grammarian among the Christians, whose *Rudimenta* appeared in 1506, was much influenced by Levita's writings, though he does not seem to have adopted Levita's peculiar views. From Reuchlin and Sebastian Münter (born 1489, died 1552), the latter a good Hebraist and editor of Levita's works, Luther and the other scholars of that age derived their acquaintance with Hebrew. Notwithstanding the sobriety of the views expressed by Luther, and even by Calvin, who both admitted the modern origin of the vowel-points in Hebrew—although this fact has been often strangely denied—the scholars of the Reformation, pressed by the difficulties urged by their Roman Catholic antagonists, and with the object in view of affirming the certainty of the Holy Scriptures, were led to give credence to the statements of modern Jewish scholars as to the correctness of the Massoretic text on the one hand, and the antiquity of the Hebrew system of vocalization on the other.

3. The opinions expressed by Levita in opposition

to the generally believed view of the antiquity of the Hebrew punctuation (see chap. iv.) attracted at first little attention, especially as they were considered to have been fully met and answered by the elder Buxtorf in his *Tiberias*, 1620, best edit. 1665. The publication of the *Arcanum punctuationis revelatum* (first published 1624, by Erpenius, without the name of the author), opened a new era. The work, which was a crushing reply to Buxtorf, the *Coryphaeus* of Hebrew scholarship, was soon acknowledged to have been written by Lud. Cappellus, professor in Saumur in France (born 1586, died 1658). Cappellus maintained that the Hebrew vowel points and accents were utterly unknown to the Biblical writers themselves, and were introduced centuries after the Christian era. The views of Cappellus were condemned by the greatest Hebrew scholars of his day. The younger Buxtorf wrote an able defence of his father's views, *Tractatus de punct. voc. et accent. in libb. V. T. Heb. origine*, 1648. The Buxtorfs, both father and son, and for a long time the great majority of the ablest Hebraists, upheld the antiquity of the vowel points. The controversy has, however, long since been decided in the opposite direction. Cappellus wrote in 1648-9 a *Vindiciae* of his early work, but the book was not published till 1689, long after the author's death. His views deeply influenced the learned Joh. Morinus, who renounced Protestantism and became a Father of the Oratory in Paris, whose Discourses on the *Sam. Pent.* were published in Paris in 1631, and his *Prolegomena* in an edition of the LXX. in folio, 1628. Only Liber i. of Morinus' *Exercit. biblicarum de Hel.*

Græcique text. sinceritate libri duo appeared in 1633, during his lifetime. He died in 1659, and his work was published in folio in 1669. Morinus' work was in many ways important, although in the interest of his Church he maintained the superiority of the texts of the LXX., Vulgate, and Samaritan, to that of the Hebrew, and maintained that God would have the Hebrew Scriptures written without points, in order that men might learn to submit to the judgment of the Church, instead of following their own private judgment !

4. B. Spinoza (1632-1677) was a decided Pantheist, and believed the Scriptures to contain no Divine revelation. The miracles of the Bible according to him were purely legendary, and he maintained that everything supernatural must be rejected as untrue. But notwithstanding such errors, Spinoza as a Biblical critic anticipated in many points the conclusions which have been slowly reached by modern criticism.

5. Richard Simon (born 1638, a Father of the Oratory in Paris, died 1712), published in 1678 his *Histoire Critique du Vieux Test.* The book was condemned and confiscated, but produced a lasting impression. It was a work of learning and research, and its conclusions, though then generally regarded with horror, would be now on many points considered conservative. According to Simon, the Pentateuch in its present shape is not the work of Moses. His theory, as summarised by Strack, is as follows: In all Eastern states there have been official historiographers, and a similar class existed among the Hebrews since the days of Moses. In

the case of the Hebrews their historiographers were, however, inspired prophets. These recorded not only what was of importance in their own day, but altered, abridged, and enlarged the works of their predecessors. All such writings were collected by Ezra and his successors ; and from the material so brought together, the books of the Old Testament were arranged in the form in which they are now extant.

6. The following works are of special importance :—J. H. Hottinger, *Thesaurus Philologicus seu clavis Scripturæ*, 1649. 2nd edit., enlarged, 1659, and after the death of the author, 1696. Bishop Brian Walton (died 1661), *Prolegomena* affixed to the London Polyglott, 1657 [see chap. ii.], issued separately by Heidegger, 1673, and by J. A. Dathe in 1777 ; also by Francis Wrangham, 2 vols., 8vo, Cantab. 1828. J. G. Carpzov, *Introductio ad libros canon. Bibl. Veteris Test. omnes*, etc. 3rd edit. 1741, and 4th, 1756-7, and his *Critica Sacra Vet. Test.*, 2nd edit. 1748. J. Chr. Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebræa*. The Old Testament is treated in tom. ii. (1721) and iv. (1733).

Among the special *Introductions* of the eighteenth century the following must be noted : J. G. Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das A. T.* 1780-83. 4th edit. five vols., 1823-24, comprising 3,199 pp. Eichhorn was a valuable and voluminous writer. J. D. Michaelis, *Einleitung in die göttlichen Schriften des alt. Bundes*, 1787. The first volume only appeared, and was directed against Eichhorn. Georg Lorenz Bauer published in 1794 his *Entwurf einer Einleitung in die Schriften des alt. Test.* The 3rd edition of this work appeared under a slightly altered title in 1806. *Entwurf einer hist.-krit. Einleitung*, etc. Bauer in the main adopts the opinions of Eichhorn.

The present century is peculiarly rich in *Introductions*. De Wette in 1817 published his *Lehrb. der hist.-krit. Einl. in die canon. u. apocr. Bücher des A. T.* The 7th edition of this work appeared in 1852. The 8th edition, edited by Eb. Schrader in 1869, is an *Introduction* based on De Wette,

rather than an edition of De Wette. It is, however, in many respects a valuable work.

Almost simultaneously with the work of De Wette, though differing from it in method and spirit, Rev. Thomas Hartwell Horne published in 1818 his *Introduction to the critical study and knowledge of the Holy Scriptures*. The work was at first comprised in three volumes, but was afterwards increased to five thick volumes (the second volume being divided into two). The 10th edition appeared in 1856, the second volume, on *The Text of the Old Testament*, having been edited by Dr. Samuel Davidson. The opinions therein expressed by Davidson gave considerable umbrage in England, though in most points they would now be considered conservative. Another edition of vol. ii. was issued in 1860, edited by Rev. J. Ayre, which harmonised more with the other portions of that work.

In 1836 and 1837 an important work appeared on the orthodox side by H. A. C. Hävernick, already distinguished by an able commentary on the Book of Daniel, namely, *Handb. der histor.-krit. Einleitung ins A. T.* The 1st vol. appeared in two parts, the first comprehending the general introduction consisting of 316 pp., the second part on the Pentateuch, of 644 pp. The latter portion has been translated into English, and published by T. and T. Clark under the title: *Hist.-Critical Introduction to the Pent.*, 1850. The 2nd vol. was likewise divided into two, the first portion on the Historical books (365 pp.), appeared in 1839, followed in 1844 by that on the Prophetical books, the 3rd vol. on the Poetical books was published after the death of the author (which occurred in 1845), in 1849 (comprising 519 pp.), worked up and edited by C. F. Keil. The 2nd edition edited by Keil did not, however, extend beyond the 1st vol., which was edited in two parts in 1854 and 1856, that editor meanwhile having written a work of his own traversing the same ground,

Heinrich Ewald appeared on the scene in 1843. Ewald published no formal Introduction to the Old Testament, but his Biblical works are so numerous as to cover the whole of the ground which would naturally be embraced in such a work. His commentary on special books will be alluded to

elsewhere. His *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, in three volumes, 1843-1852, must here be noted, the 3rd edition of which issued in 1864-68, comprises seven thick volumes. This work has been translated into English by J. Estlin Carpenter, and published by Longmans and Co. in eight large volumes at various dates from 3rd edit., 1883. Dean Stanley's *History of the Jewish Church*, the 6th edition of which work appeared in three volumes in 1875, is in the main founded on the History of Ewald, whose opinions on many points are reproduced and set forth in a more vivid and popular style. Ewald's work on *Die Alterthümer des Volkes Israel*, 1866, ought here to be mentioned, and his *Jahrbücher der bibl. Wissenschaft* in twelve parts, published between 1848 and 1865.

C. F. Keil in 1853 published his *Lehrbuch der hist.-krit. Einl. in die kanonisch. Schrift. des A. T.* In the 2nd edition the Apocryphal books were added. The 3rd edition (776 pp.) appeared in 1873. This work, like all Keil's commentaries, is written from a decidedly orthodox standpoint. J. J. Stähelin's *Einleitung in die kan. Bücher*, published in 1862, is smaller, but important.

In England, Dr. S. Davidson, whose edition of Horne, vol. ii., has been alluded to above, published his own *Introduction to the Old Testament, Critical, Historical and Theological*, in three vols., in 1862. The work contains much valuable matter, but exhibits signs of haste, is written from a much more "advanced" standpoint than its author assumed in 1860. It is unfortunately permeated by a bitterness of spirit, perhaps natural under the circumstances. No work of equal importance has as yet appeared in England on the orthodox side. An earlier work of the same author on *Biblical Criticism* issued in 1854, is still of importance for the English student, and treats of many subjects which would naturally find a place in a formal Introduction. Dr. Davidson published in 1855 another important work, *The Hebrew Text of the Old Testament Revised*. His work on *The Canon of the Bible, its formation, history, and fluctuations*, 3rd edition, 1880, is a reprint of his article in 9th edit. of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* with additions.

Friedr. Bleek's *Einleitung in das A. T.*, published in 1860, a year after the death of its author, has had considerable influence. The 3rd edition, edited by Ad. Kamphausen in 1870, is specially useful for students. The 4th edition was partly re-written by J. Wellhausen (1878), i.e. on Judges, Samuel, Kings, etc. The 5th edit. (1886) is mainly a reprint of Bleek's own work. Both these editions contain a long and important section on the Text of the Old Test. by Wellhausen.

In this department it is convenient here to mention Theodor Nöldeke's works, his *Alt.-test. Literatur in einer Reihe von Aufsätzen dargestellt*, 1868, and his *Untersuchungen zur Kritik des A. T.*, 1869. Ab. Geiger, *Urschrift u. Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, 1857; Fürst, *Gesch. des bibl. Lit.* in 2 vols., 1867, 1870, as well as his work on *Der Kanon des A. T., nach den Ueberlieferungen in Talmud u. Midrasch*, 1868, are important for students, as are W. Robertson Smith's works : *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, 1881, and *The Prophets of Israel and their Place in History*, 1882, however much one may differ from the views therein propounded.

Ed. Reuss, *Geschichte der heil. Schriften A. T.*, was published in 1881. A new and enlarged edition (780 pp.) has appeared this year, 1890. Vatke's *Hist.-Krit. Einleitung* was published in 1886, edited by Dr. Preiss long after the death of its author, the literature brought down to the present time. A. Kuennen published at Leyden his *Hist.-krit. Onlerzoek* in 1863-65, of the first part of which, a Germ. trans., has appeared, ed. by Th. Weber, 1885-1890, as well as a French trans. An English trans., of Part. i., by P. H. Wicksteed, *Hist.-Crit. Hist. of Origin and Comp. of the Hexateuch*, has been published by Macmillan, 1886.

H. L. Strack's short but important *Einleitung* appeared in Zöckler's *Handbuch der theol. Wissenschaften*, Band i., in 1885, 3rd ed. 1888; it can be had separately. To these may be added a small but well executed work by Frants Buhl, Professor in Copenhagen, now in Leipzig, *Den gammel testamentlige Skriftoverlevering*: i. Kanons historie; ii. Tekstens hist., Copenhagen, 1885. A. Brandt has also published a

Bearbeitung of E. Riehm's *Einleitung in d. A. T.*, Band i., *Die Thora und die vordcren Propheten*, 1889.

The Biblical dictionaries must not be lost sight of. Among the German are to be noted among the earlier, Winer's *Bibl. Realwörterbuch*, 2 vols., 1847, 1848; the very convenient *Handwörterbuch der bibl. Altertums*, edited by Riehm in 2 vols., 1884, and others, especially Herzog-Plitt, *Encyclopædie für prot. Theol. u. Kirche*; Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopædie für Bibel u. Talmud*, 1870, 1883, and Supplement-band, 1886.

Among the English, besides the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, which especially in its later editions contains many articles of value to the Biblical student, are to be mentioned, Kitto, *Biblical Literature*, 1845; 3rd edit. by W. L. Alexander, 1862-70. Smith's *Bible Dictionary*, 3 vols, 1861, 1863.

Several important works in this department have also been produced by Roman Catholic scholars on the Continent, such as J. Jahn's (died 1816) *Einleitung in die göttl. Bücher des A. Bundes*, 1st edition, 1793; 2nd edition, largely increased, in two thick volumes (570 and 1042 pp.), in 1802-3. J. G. Herbst (died 1836), *Hist.-krit. Einl. in die heil. Schriften des A. T.*, ed. by Welte, 1840-1844. J. M. A. Scholz (died 1852), *Einleitung in die heilig. Schr. des A. T.*, 1844-1848, left unfinished. D. Haneberg, *Gesch. der bibl. Offenb. als Einl.*, 1850; 4th edition, 1876 (882 pp.). F. H. Reusch, *Lehrb. der Einl.*, 1859; 4th edition, 1870. Franz Kaulen, *Einl. in die heil. Schrift. A. u. N. T.*, 1876 and 1881, 2nd ed. 1884.

CHAPTER II.

THE PRINTED HEBREW EDITIONS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. THE first portion of the Hebrew Old Testament printed was the Book of Psalms, issued in 1477 along with Kimchi's commentary. In 1488 the complete Hebrew Bible was printed in folio in Soncino. It was afterwards printed in Pesaro in 1494, and in Brescia the same year. The latter edition was that used by Luther, and the copy that belonged to the great Reformer is still preserved in the Royal Library, Berlin.

2. The Great Rabbinical Bibles, so called because they contain the Targums, with various Jewish commentaries, were printed in four volumes folio, and issued from Bomberg's press as follows: (1) Venice, 1516-18, edited by Felix Pratensis. (2) Venice, 1524-5, edited by Jacob Ben Chayyim. This is the first edition with the Massorah Magna (see chap. v.). (3) Venice, 1546-48. (4) *Id.*, 1568. (5) *Id.*, 1617-19. (6) Joh. Buxtorf, the elder, brought out his important edition in Basle in 1618-19. Many corrections were introduced in this edition into the Massorah. Buxtorf unfortunately pointed the Targums after the analogy of the Aramaic portions in Ezra and Daniel.

(7) The most important, however, of the Rabbinical Bibles is the **קהילת משה**, edited by Mosheh of Frankfort, Amsterdam, 1724-27.

3. The great Polyglott Bibles are the following :
(1) The *Complutensian*, printed at the cost of Cardinal Ximenes, in six folio vols, 1514-17. The first four vols. contain the Old Testament. The *Complutensian* gives the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, the Targums and LXX., all with Latin translations. The text of the LXX. there given is that of Lucian (see chap. viii.). (2) The *Antwerp Polyglott* was published in 1569-72, at the cost of Philip II., called therefrom *Biblia regia*, and also from its printer, *Plantiniana*. Its editor was Arias Montanus. The Old Testament is contained in the first four volumes. The Targum is appended to all the books of the Old Testament, except Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles. (3) The *Paris Polyglott* consists of ten large folios. The Old Testament is also contained in the first four volumes, reprinted from the Antwerp Polyglott. The New Testament occupies vols. v. and vi. The last three volumes contain the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Samaritan Version with the Syriac and Arabic translations of the Old Testament, all provided with Latin translations. (4) The most important is the *London Polyglott*, edited by Bishop Brian Walton, in eight folio volumes, 1657. It contains the Hebrew text, the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the Samaritan Version, the LXX. with various readings of Cod. Alex., the Latin Vulgate, with the fragments of the old Latin translation (the *Itala*), and the Syriac and Arabic

Versions; the Targums (including that known as the Pseudo-Jon. and Jerusalem), together with the Æthiopic Version of Psalms and Canticles, and a Persian translation of the Pentateuch, all with Latin translations. The first volume contains the valuable Prolegomena of Walton. The last two volumes, printed in 1669, contain the *Lexicon heptaglottum* of Ed. Castell—Hebrew, Chaldaic, Syriac, Samaritan, Æthiopic and Arabic, and a Persian Vocabulary.

4. Besides these there are certain other important editions. Menachem ben Jehuda di Lonsano published in 1618, afterwards in 1659, the Pentateuch under the name **אור תורה** as a first part of an edition which was to have included the whole Old Testament. It contains a critical commentary, and a text founded on ten MSS. Norzi's *Massoretic Bible Commentary*, founded on his critical codex, completed in 1626, was first published by Raphael Chayyim Basila in his edition of the Hebrew Bible, 1742-44. It is also contained in the Warsaw Rabbinical Bible. See for full description of these editions, Strack's *Einleitung*, 3rd. ed. p. 262.

Of considerable importance to the Hebrew student is the *Biblia Hebraica* (1720) of J. D. Michaelis (Professor in Halle, who died 1738), containing a collection of several important Hebrew MSS., the Massorah, parallel passages and short notes. This Bible can generally be had at a very moderate price. Kennicott's folio edition of *Vet. Test. Heb. cum variis lectionibus*, 1776, 1780, though important, is in many respects disappointing. Of greater value is De Rossi, *Variæ Lectiones Vet. Test. ex immensa manuscriptorum editorumque codicum congerie haustæ*, four quarto vols., 1784-88, with his *Schol. critica in V. T. libb., seu supplementa ad varias sacri textus lectiones*, 4to, 1798. The collation of Kennicott extends only to the consonants, that of De Rossi embraces occasionally the punctuation. Useful for ordinary purposes is Dr. S. Davidson's *Revised Hebrew Text*, 1855, with a digest of various readings. But such works must be used with caution.

5. A printed manual edition of the Hebrew Bible was first issued by Bomberg in 1517, and several times reprinted at later dates. Buxtorf also published such an edition in 1611, and J. Leusden in 1667, printed by Athias. Jablonksi's 4to edition, which was founded on former editions with a coll. of some MSS., appeared in 1699; and Van der Hooght's, which mainly followed Leusden's, appeared first in 1705, and was reprinted with minor corrections by Aug. Hahn, 1831, and C. G. G. Theile, 1849, and at later dates. The most important editions of the Massoretic text, published in single parts, but unfortunately not yet completed, are those of S. Baer and Franz Delitzsch. Of the *Pentateuch* only *Genesis* has yet appeared, published in 1869. Of "the former prophets" or Historical Books, no portion has yet appeared. "The later prophets" are now complete: *Isaiah*, 1872; *Jeremiah*, 1890; *Ezekiel*, 1884; and *The Twelve*, 1878. The Hagiographa is also complete, comprising *Psalms*, 1880; *Proverbs*, 1880; *Job*, 1875. *The Megilloth* (Cant., Ruth, Threni, Eccl., Esther), 1886. *Libri, Dan., Ezræ, et Neh.*, 1882; *Liber Chronicorum*, 1888. No ordinary student should be without these texts. They contain important critical and Massoretic appendices, that of Daniel with full Chaldee paradigms of nouns, numerals, and verbs, and with important Latin prefaces. The Psalter especially is most important. Seligman Baer is the best Massoretic scholar of the day. The student should, however, note that there are different Massoretic traditions on some texts. See Strack, *Theol. Lit. Zeitung*, 1879, No. 8.

Of unpointed editions we may note the *Biblia Hebraica sine punctis*, 1701. S. Baer published an unpointed edition of the Pentateuch in 1866; often reprinted; and an edition of Genesis has been issued: *Liber Geneseos sine punctis exscriptus curavit F. Mühlau et Aem. Kautzsch*, 1868, 2nd. ed. 1885.

Further information on the editions of the Hebrew Bible will be found in Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebraea*, 1715-33; J. Le Long, *Biblioth. Sacra*, fol. 1723. *Bibl. Sacra post. . . . J. Le Long et C. F. Boerner iter. curas ord. dispos. emend. etc. ab A. G. Masch*, 1778-90. M. Steinschneider, *Catal. libb. heb. in biblioth. Bodl.*, 1852-60.

CHAPTER III.

THE STATE OF THE HEBREW TEXT AND THE HEBREW MSS.

1. FOR a considerable time after the restoration of Hebrew studies, the text of the Hebrew Bible was generally considered to be free from all serious corruption. The care taken by the Jewish copyists, and the minute directions given in the Massorah and elsewhere, all seemed to point to such a conclusion. The Massoretic scholars duly numbered the letters, noted the sections and middle words of each book, called attention to peculiarities of orthography, grammar and punctuation, accumulating a mass of grammatical and lexicographical notes, and giving in many cases a tolerably complete concordance. A text guarded so jealously was very naturally presumed for all practical purposes to be well-nigh perfect.

2. But the examination and collation of the existing Hebrew MSS. by degrees dispelled that illusion. Human nature is prone to err, however elaborate may be the safeguards against such a weakness. Although the main contents of the sacred Scriptures have been well preserved, those Scriptures have not come down to us in the exact shape in which they were first written, or even as finally edited by their

pre-Christian revisers. The Massoretes did their best to establish a uniform text, and in doing so stereotyped not a few corruptions. And the Hebrew MSS., though substantially following the text as settled by those scholars, were, when duly examined by Kennicott, De Rossi, and others, proved to abound in mistakes, arising from accidental repetitions and omissions of letters and words, in the latter case frequently occasioned by similarity of ending (*homoioteleuton*). Numerous blunders arose from the similarity in form of many of the letters in the modern or square Hebrew alphabet, made use of by the Massoretes. Such blunders, in most cases, were easily corrected by the comparison of MSS., and by due attention to the Massoretic notes. But the Massorah itself has been discovered to be by no means uniform; and notwithstanding the herculean efforts of the early scholars, such as the Buxtorfs and others, we are only now beginning to approximate to a correct Massoretic text.

The Massorah (see chap. v.) is a work for which Biblical students must ever be grateful. The task undertaken by those early Hebrew scholars was performed with the greatest conscientiousness. This fact is abundantly proved even by the errors left in many cases uncorrected in the text, though corrected in the margin. A Biblical critic cannot, however, admit the infallibility of the Massoretes, however greatly he may respect their learning.

3. It must not be forgotten that the Hebrew Scriptures passed through serious vicissitudes. In the persecution in the days of Manasseh many copies

of the Holy Scriptures were probably destroyed. In the time of the prophet Hosea, while altars, contrary to the Mosaic Law, were multiplied in the northern kingdom, the written Scriptures were comparatively unknown (Hos. viii. 12). When the temple and its treasures were destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar, and the people carried off into captivity, innumerable copies of the sacred Scriptures, and of other Jewish writings, necessarily perished. In the days of Antiochus Epiphanes special search was made everywhere for copies of the Law, in order to destroy all such Scriptures (1 Macc. i. 56-58). Similar occurrences took place when Jerusalem was captured by Titus, and in the horrors that followed. The copy of the Law brought to Rome by Titus, which was probably the official copy in use in the temple, has unfortunately perished. At the close of the great rebellion under Bar Cochba thousands of Jewish scholars perished, and their books were burned with fire. In the *auto-da-fès* of professedly Christian days many precious Hebrew MSS. were ruthlessly destroyed.

It is not strange, therefore, that the present Hebrew text should be found in many places corrupt. The wonder is rather that the Hebrew Scriptures should have been preserved in any form whatever. The memories of faithful disciples must have in many cases been had recourse to in order to fill up gaps in the sacred text. The comparative uniformity of the Massoretic Hebrew MSS. is, as has been noted, no proof of the correctness of the Massoretic text.

4. But it must also be borne in mind that the earlier books of the Hebrew Scriptures, when com-

mitted to writing, were written in characters very different in form from those in use in later days. The oldest extant Hebrew alphabet is that exhibited on the Moabite stone and in the Siloam inscription. The former monument cannot be much later than the days of the great Elijah, the latter is not considerably later. The Hebrew character exhibited in both was in common use for centuries afterwards. It is substantially the same as that found on the Maccabee coins. It was only by slow degrees that the more modern square or Aramaic character came into use. The Samaritan alphabet is the ancient character in a more ornamental form. However strange the fact may be, it is certain that the Samaritans preserved the older alphabet, while the Jews adopted the more modern. The mutual hatred between Jews and Samaritans may have been one of the causes which led the Jewish scribes after the Captivity to adopt the Aramaic character for their sacred writings, although the old characters were still used for profane purposes on coins and inscriptions.

This change of the Hebrew alphabet took place long prior to the Christian era, and even prior to execution of the LXX. version. It is probable it met with much opposition, and was not acquiesced in for a considerable period. Traces of such opposition may be discovered even in post-Christian times. The Talmud speaks of the square characters as "Assyrian" (*Sanhedrin*, 21 b), and directs the Law to be written in that character (*Zebach.*, 62 a). It recognises thus the novelty of the new alphabet, although the fact was afterwards generally forgotten,

and the square character asserted to be the more ancient.

In the transliteration of the sacred books from one character to another, it is certain that many blunders must have occurred. The vowel-letters (אַהֲרֹן), which, in the earlier method of writing, were used sparingly, were introduced more extensively at later periods, in order to assist in fixing the correct sound of words. The invention of a complete system of vowel-points and accents, valuable as it was, was centuries later than the Christian era (see chap. iv.).

5. The existing Hebrew MSS. are of various kinds: (1) The unpointed synagogue rolls, which are usually of parchment, or in the East, of leather. These contain the Pentateuch, and the five Megilloth (technically *Rolls*), viz. Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther. (2) Pointed MSS., which are generally in book form, and are written both on parchment and paper. Most of these contain the Massorah, more or less complete. Some MSS. have also the Targum, which is occasionally written in parallel columns; but in many cases the verses of the Targum are written alternately with those of the Hebrew. Hebrew MSS. are classified according to their country and characteristic readings. According to most scholars, the present Hebrew MSS. are considered to be more or less correct copies of one pattern codex. But that view is not universally accepted. The vowel-points and accents have as yet been very partially collated. The varieties of reading, too, presented in the Talmud have not yet been scientifically collated.

6. The Samaritan MSS. of the Pentateuch may also be regarded to all intents and purposes as Hebrew MSS. They present, indeed, in many respects a different text, and much fruit was at one time expected from their collation. Unfortunately they have proved to be of comparatively little importance for critical purposes. The text they present is, on the whole, not earlier than the Hebrew, and has been seriously tampered with for theological and polemical purposes. But the Samaritan recension is by no means worthless. It is of real importance when it is supported by the authority of the LXX. and the Targums.

Strack in his *Prolegomena* has given a description of some of the ancient Hebrew MSS. See also the Prefaces to Baer and Delitzsch's editions of Hebrew Texts noted ch. ii. 5. Strack, in the *Zeitschrift für Luth. Theol.*, 1875, p. 598 ff. Harkavy has described some remarkable fragments of MSS. from Rhodes, written in a peculiar alphabet, in *Mémoires de l' Académie Imp. de St. Petersburg*, Ser. vii., Tom. xxxii., 1884, No. 8. See also Derenbourg in the *Revue des Études Juives*, x., 311, and Harkavy, *Catalog der Samar. Pent. Codices*, 1874. On the Samaritan codex itself, which is simply Hebrew written in the more ancient or Samaritan characters, see Gesenius, *De Pent. Sam. orig. indele et auctorit. comm. phil. crit.*, 1815. All the Samaritan MSS. present more or less correctly the same recension. The MS. at Nablous, though unquestionably ancient, presents a text inferior in almost all points to the Massoretic. See more in chap. vi.

7. The oldest extant Hebrew MS., the date of which can be affirmed with certainty, is the MS. of the Prophets, punctuated after the Babylonian system. The MS. was brought from the Crimea by the dis-

tinguished Karaite scholar, A. Firkowitsch, and is dated A.D. 916. It is now in the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg. The MS. has been edited in facsimile by H. L. Strack, *Proph. Posterior. Codex Babylonicus Petropolitanus*, St. Petersburg, 1876, and a separate edition, also in facsimile, of *Hosea et Joel prophetæ* was edited by the same scholar, Leipzig, 1875. The oldest MS. of the entire Old Testament belonged also formerly to Firkowitsch's collection, and is dated A.D. 1010.

Owing to the numerous falsifications which Firkowitsch introduced into the ancient epigraphs in his most valuable collection of MSS., with the object of showing the superiority of the MSS. preserved by the Karaites over those of the Rabbinical Jews, the epigraphs in question have been deprived of nearly all their value, although Chwolson still maintains some of them to be genuine.

The fabrications in question have been discussed by Harkavy in the *Memoires de l'Acad. de St. Petersburg*, vii., 24, No. 1; by H. L. Strack in his *A. Firkowitsch u. seine Entdeckungen*, 1876, in the *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1876, as well as in the *Zeitschrift der D. M. G.*, xxxiv., 163 ff.; the *Literar. Centralblatt* for 1883, col. 878; and by Chwolson in his *Corpus Inscript. Heb.*, 1882.

There are other ancient Hebrew MSS., but not of hoar antiquity. The epigraph in a Cambridge MS., which makes it to have been written in 856, is also a manifest fabrication. The epigraph in the Aleppo codex (the antiquity of which MS. was assigned to the beginning of the tenth century), which was thought to be genuine by eminent scholars, is

now maintained by Wickes, from internal evidence, to be likewise a fabrication. See W. Wickes, *Treatise on the Accentuation of the Twenty-one so-called Prose Books of the Old Testament*, 1887, and on the whole subject the Introduction to Professor Driver's *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, 1890. The Cairo codex of the Prophets is dated 897, and there is another Cairo MS. of 1028.

8. Apart, too, from the circumstances mentioned above, the paucity of really ancient Hebrew MSS. has been also to a large extent caused by the ancient practice of the Jews to bury all sacred MSS. which were found to be either defective through wear, or otherwise discovered to be faulty. The practice of *ונינה*, or burial, of such MSS., is often alluded to in the Talmud. See specially the *Masechet Sopherim* (edited by Dr. Joel Müller, 1878), v. 14, 15; Strack, *Proleg. Critica in V. T. Heb.*, 1873, p. 42. The latter work, now out of print, ought to be in the hands of every student, as containing a considerable amount of information on subjects which here can only be glanced at, and many of which must, indeed, be omitted; Prof. Strack is preparing a new work on the subject. Important articles on the Hebrew text, by Rev. Professor T. K. Abbott, Dublin, have appeared in the *Church Quarterly Review*: "The Massoretic Text of the Old Testament," April, 1887, and "The Hebrew Text before the Massoretes," April, 1889; and it is to be hoped that those articles may be reprinted in a separate form (see chap. v.).

Useful for popular purposes, as containing a good deal of information, is *The Old Documents and the New Bible, an easy*

22 THE STATE OF THE HEBREW TEXT.

lesson for the people in Biblical Criticism. By J. Paterson Smyth, LL.B., B.D.: Bagster, 1890. The facsimile plates are specially good.

Important for students are : R. Hoerning, *British Museum Karaite MSS. Description and Collation of six Karaite Manuscripts of portions of the Hebrew Bible in Arabic characters*; with a complete reproduction by the autotype process of one, Ex. i. 1 to viii. 5, in 42 facsimiles: Williams and Norgate, 1889. D. Chwolson, *Corpus Inscriptionum Hebraicarum* enthaltend Grabschriften aus der Krim . . . sowie auch Schriftproben aus Handschriften von ix.-xv. Jahrhundert. Gesamm. u. erläutert, 1882. The Palæograph. Soc. *Facsimiles of Manuscripts and Inscriptions. Oriental Series*, edited by Professor William Wright, LL.D., 1875-1883. Ad. Neubauer, *Catalogue of the Hebrew MSS. in the Bodleian Library etc., with Forty Facsimiles*, Oxford, 1886.

CHAPTER IV.

THE HISTORY OF THE HEBREW PUNCTUATION.

1. **A**LTHOUGH much has been written on the question, the history of the origin of the vowels and accents affixed to the Massoretic text is still obscure. Jerome makes no mention of any such signs, nor are they referred to by the Jewish scholars of whom mention is made in the Talmuds. In the Talmudic treatises, however, grammatical disquisitions are rare, so that the negative evidence derived from those sources is not entirely conclusive. The invention of the vowel points and accents was generally ascribed to Ezra by the Jewish scholars of the Middle Ages, and that theory was regarded as moderate, because there were then scholars who maintained that the invention of the vowels went back to the age of Moses, and even to an earlier period. The theory of the invention of the points by Ezra has been found to rest entirely upon the misunderstanding of a passage in the Talmud, *Megilla*, 3 a. (See J. Derenbourg, *Manuel du lecteur*, edited from a Yemen MS. now in Bodleian Library, Oxford, in the *Journal Asiat.*, 1870, published separately, Paris, 1871.) The modern invention of the points was first taught by Elias Levita, in his great work, the *Massoreth-ha-*

Massoreth, published in 1538. The publication of that work created a new epoch in Hebrew literature. Elias Levita was constantly visited by those eager to imbibe some of his learning, and for a time even Reuchlin was his pupil. Levita's views, though combated ably by his learned co-religionist, Azariah de Rossi, in 1574-5, gradually prevailed. His opinions were presented by Cappellus in a form which Levita himself would not have given to them. The view of Levita and Cappellus on the point is now universally accepted by scholars, although for many generations it was assailed by earnest men as wholly subversive of the truths of revelation. Compare Dr. John Owen's work on the *Integrity and Purity of the Hebrew and Greek Text*, issued in 1659, and his comments there on Walton's *Prolegomena* to the *London Polyglott*.

2. The student must, however, be on his guard against being led astray by the detailed statements put forth (as was then believed on good authority) by even such scholars as Graetz, Delitzsch, Ginsburg (in his edition of Levita's *Massoreth-ha-Massoreth*, pp. 61-63), Kalisch, *Heb. Gram.* (Part ii., pp. 63, 64), and others, in which the names even of the early punctuators are given. Those statements were based upon the epigraphs unfortunately proved to have been partially forged by Firkowitsch. (See chap. iii. 7.) It is tolerably certain that the punctuation of the Hebrew text was the work of scholars between the sixth and eighth centuries; and it is probable that the two systems now extant were preceded by some ruder and less perfect method of vocalization, intro-

duced for the purpose of assisting beginners in the difficult task of reading Hebrew. Wickes, in his work on the *Hebrew Prose Accents* (1887), p. 144, has pointed out conclusively that the so-called Babylonian punctuation, which was superlinear, is, though an Oriental punctuation, not identical with the Oriental punctuation, and he even maintains that it must have been later than the usual or Palestinian system. See also Strack in the *Zeitschrift f. Luth. Theol.*, 1877, p. 21.

3. The vowel-points in Arabic were, like those in Hebrew, a very modern invention, and their introduction into the Koran was at first opposed. (See on the Arabic points, Nöldeke, *Gesch. des Qorâns*, p. 309.) In Syriac different stages of punctuation can be distinctly traced, for there are: (1) wholly unpointed texts; (2) texts marked with diacritic signs, which, though not marking all the vowels, afford material help to the reader; and (3) texts vocalized with either Greek or Syriac vowels. But such successive stages in Hebrew have not yet been discovered in extant MSS.

4. When the Palestinian system of punctuation was finally adopted by the Rabbinites, it is highly probable that the punctuation known as the Babylonian was in many cases obliterated. The punctuation in MSS. seems to have been often added by a different hand, or possibly by the same scribe at a different sitting.

Upon the whole of this subject the student should consult Dr. C. D. Ginsburg's valuable edition of *The Massoreth-ha. Massoreth of Elias Levita* in Hebrew and English, with critical and explanatory notes, and a life of Elias Levita, 1867,

as also the same scholar's edition in English of *Jacob ben Chajim's Introduction to the Rabbinical Bible*, 2nd edition, 1867. Buxtorf's *Tiberias sive Comm. Masoreticus Tripleæ*, 1620, last edition 1665. Leusden's *Philologus Hebreæns*, 1739. Hansen, *Interpretatio Masore magne textualis*, Kjobenhavn, 1733-1737. Wickes has some judicious remarks on the subject in his work on the *Hebrew Prose Accents* (1887), pp. 5-8, and Professor Driver's Introduction in his *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, 1890, is indispensable for the English student. Harris' articles in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 1889 (see p. 34), give a useful summary of the history. See Strack, *Die biblisch. u. massoret. Handschriften in Tschufutkale* in the *Zeitschrift f. luth. Theol.*, 1875.

5. The vagaries of the short-lived Hutchinsonian school, including among others the lexicographer Parkhurst—still strangely viewed in some quarters in England as an authority—need not be more than referred to. Independently of those who actually followed the follies of Hutchinson, and sought to invent a new Hebrew language for themselves, there were many able scholars, such as Lowth, Blayney, Horsley, and others, who had often recourse to the wildest conjectures in the way of emendation of the Massoretic text, and whose proposed emendations ran in many instances entirely counter to the now ascertained principles of Hebrew grammar and syntax. However far we may be from affirming the infallibility of the Massoretic text and punctuation, the vowel points, and even the accents affixed by the Massoretes, are not only valuable as preserving to us the traditional reading of the ancient text, but are also equally valuable as preserving the true grammatical inflexions of the Hebrew. Although the ancient Versions are of

importance in the correction of the Hebrew text, yet on the whole the latter has been preserved by the Massoretes in a far more correct form than exhibited in any ancient version whatever; and the charges often so recklessly made as to the wilful perversions of the sacred text by the Jewish scholars, when examined into, rest upon no solid basis.

6. The two systems of punctuation extant in Hebrew are: (1) The elaborate system exhibited in all the printed Hebrew Bibles, which was brought to its present perfection by the scholars of Tiberias, and is now known as the Palestinian system. In this system the vowels and accents are placed partly above and partly below the consonants to which they belong, special accentual signs not found elsewhere being made use of in the Books of the Psalms, Proverbs and Job. (2) The existence of the less perfect Babylonian or Assyrian system of punctuation was first made known to scholars in 1840, and was more fully described in Pinner's *Prospectus* of the Odessa MSS., 1845. In the Babylonian system, which is generally considered older than that of Tiberias—though Wickes, as already noted, has given strong reasons against that opinion—the vowel signs and accents are almost uniformly placed above the consonants. The Babylonian vowel signs have been proved to be rude modifications of the three vowel-letters, נ, י, ו, the initial letters of the names of the several accents being made use of as signs to indicate those accents. A large number of Hebrew MSS. have lately been brought from the East in which this punctuation is still preserved, and it is highly probable that in not a few MSS. the

Babylonian punctuation has been washed out, and the Palestinian substituted.

Strack's magnificent *Codex Babylonicus Petropolitanus*, and his edition of *Hosea and Joel* (see ch. iii. 7), are the best specimens of Hebrew texts furnished with these points. A beautifully printed Chaldee or Aramaic text, pointed after the Babylonian system, is exhibited in Merx's *Chrestomathia Targumica*, 1888, which contains also a list of Babylonian MSS., and for cheapness and accuracy may well be commended to all students. The full title is : *Chrest. Targumica quam collatis libb. MSS. antiq. Tib. editionibusque impressis celeb. ad codices vocalibus Babylonie instructos*, edid. adn. crit. et gloss. instruxit Ad. Merx. See also ch. v. 4.

7. It may be well to notice : Gesenius, *Gesch. der hebr. Spr. und Schrift*, 1815. Steinschneider, *Bibliogr. Handb. über die theor. u. prakt. Literatur für hebr. Sprachkunde*, 1859. Gesenius, *Thesaurus phil.-crit. ling. Heb. et Chald.*, 3 vols, 4to, last part of 3rd vol. by Rödiger, 1835-1858, is still a veritable treasure-house of Biblical learning. Of Gesenius' *Heb. und Chald. Handwörterb.*, the 9th and subsequent editions have been *neu bearbeitet* von F. Mühlau u. W. Volck, 1883 to 1890. While this manual Lex. of Gesenius has been improved in every successive edition, no English translation has appeared since that of Tregelles, published by Bagster in 1853. Hence in many respects B. Davies' *Student's Heb. Lex.*, 1872, is more useful for English students unacquainted with German. J. Fürst, *Heb. und Chald. Handwörterb.* is of importance, though not equal to Gesenius. The 3rd edition by V. Ryssel, appeared in 1876. A 4th edition of an English translation of the 2nd German by S. Davidson in 1871, which is fuller and more accurate than Fürst. Fried. Delitzsch's *Proleg. eines neuen Heb.-Aramäisch. W.B. z. A.T.* is important.

Buxtorf, *Heb. et Chald. Concordantiae* appeared in 1632 in folio. An improved edition by B. Bär in 1867. J. Fürst, *Concord. Heb. atque Chald.*, in fol., 1840, much improved, but with fanciful etymologies. C. Noldii, *Concord. particularium ebræo-chald.* issued in 1679, *recens.* J. G. Tympius in 1734, is

still the only available work in that department. An English edition of Buxtorf's Concordance was issued by B. Davidson in 1876. The *Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance*, 2nd edit., 1860, deserves mention, as also *The Hebraist's Vade Mecum*, 1867, both published by Bagster. Dr. S. Mandelkern, of Leipzig, has issued a prospectus of *Die neubearbeitete Heb.-Chald. Bibel Concordanz*, likely to surpass its predecessors.

In grammar, it is only necessary to mention: Gesenius, *Ausführl. gram.-krit. Lehrgebäude*, 1817. His smaller *Heb. gramm.*, first issued in 1813, passed through many editions under its author's eye, and afterwards as edited by Rödiger. The 22nd and subsequent editions by E. Kautzsch have been entirely rewritten, the 25th in 1889 much improved. The American scholar E. C. Mitchell has issued B. Davies' translation "thoroughly revised" in 1880. Ewald's *Lehrbuch* first appeared in 1827, the 8th edition in 1870. Most important for English students is the *Syntax* of this work translated by Jas. Kennedy: T. and T. Clark, 1879. Kennedy has also published his own *Introd. to Bib. Hebrew*, presenting graduated instruction, 1889. J. Olshausen, *Lehrbuch*, published in 1861 is valuable, though the author died without writing the Syntax. Olshausen's work touches upon compar. Semitic grammar. Prof. W. Robertson Smith has just published the late Prof. W. Wright's *Lectures on Comparative Semitic Grammar*, Camb. Univ. Press, 1890. In Italian, Luzzatfo's grammatical works are most important, 1853-69. Böttcher's *Ausführl. Lehrb.*, issued in two royal 8vo vols., 1866, 1868 (embracing over 1,300 pp.), is a great grammatical concordance. The author died ere he reached the Syntax. Important are: F. E. König, *Hist.-krit. Lehrgeb.*, 1881 (first half). B. Stade, *Lehrb.* (first half), 1879. In English, A. B. Davidson wrote a valuable *Introd. Heb. Grammar*, and frequently reprinted, 1876. The following are by American scholars, W. H. Green, *Grammar*, 4th edit., Part i., 1888; Part ii., *Syntax*, 1889. W. R. Harper, *Elements of Hebrew by inductive method*, 10th edit., 1889. *Elements of Syntax*, 1888; *Introd. Heb. Method and Manual*, 4th edit., a book of useful exercises, 1888. Most important is Driver's *Hebrew Tenses*, 2nd edit., 1881. H. L. Strack's useful

small *Heb. Grammar*, 4th enlarged edit., 1891, with *Exercises*, translated by A. R. S. Kennedy, is to be had both in German and English. Strack and Siegfried's *Lehrb. der neuheb. Sprache und Litt.* 1884, deserves to be better known. A. B. Davidson's *Outlines of Heb. Accentuation* appeared in 1861, but the accents of the Hebrew are best treated by W. Wickes, the *Poetical*, 1881, the *Prose* in 1887, both published by the Clarendon Press, Oxford. I. Nordheimer's *Heb. Gram.*, 2 vols., appeared in New York, 1838, 1841; 2nd edit., 1842. G. Bickell's *Outlines of Heb. Grammar*, trans. by S. I. Curtiss, Leipzig, 1877, is a small but scientific work, not elementary. Many important articles on Hebrew grammar have appeared from time to time in Professor Harper's *Hebraica*. The Syntax of Aug. Müller's useful *Schulgrammatik* has been recently edited in English by Prof. Robertson, of Glasgow, under the title *Outlines of Hebrew Syntax*, 2nd edit., 1887.

CHAPTER V.

THE JEWISH MASSORAH.

1. THE elaborate care taken by the Jews for the preservation of the true text of their sacred books has already been noticed. But such efforts cannot be traced back further than several centuries posterior to the Christian era. Although Philo asserts that "the Jews never altered a word of what was written by Moses," and Josephus maintains that nothing was added to the text of Scripture or taken therefrom, such statements cannot be regarded as absolutely true, because it is certain that additions and glosses were from time to time added to the various books. Moreover the assertions of Philo and Josephus are opposed to the facts disclosed by an examination of the LXX. and of the other Versions. There is, however, no ground for accusing the Jews of wilfully corrupting the sacred text, an accusation constantly preferred against them by the Church Fathers, as well as by later writers. The care taken by the Jews in post-Christian days to preserve intact the books committed to them, led to the execution of the work generally designated under the name of the Massorah.

2. The expression *מִפְרָה* (or less correctly *מִסְרָה*,

from מִסְרָה), Bibl. Hebrew **מִסְרָה**, *Massorah*, denotes "tradition," and specially the tradition connected with the correct reading of the sacred text. It is incorrect to regard it as a deriv. of **אַפֶּר**, meaning *bond, vinculum*. Under the name is often included (1) the vowel points and accents, and (2) more correctly the critical notes affixed to the Hebrew MSS. The latter recount the number of times certain rare words or combinations of words occur, and call attention to divers peculiarities. The short Massorah is often divided into various heads: the short notes written on the margin of MSS., or of the large Rabbinic Bibles, are known as the *Massora marginalis*, which is an abridgment of the *Massora magna*, which latter was written above or below the text, and often in MSS. in all sorts of grotesque forms. The *Massora parva* is written on the sides of the margins and between the columns, and contains divers notes on words and sentences which occur only once, or on various peculiarities in vowel points or consonants, which are noted by mnemonical signs. Larger notes are sometimes found at the end of the MS., and thus designated the *Massora finalis*. These Massoretic notes are by no means uniform, and are not unfrequently opposed to one another. Ginsburg's notes give abundant instances of differences between the Massorah as quoted by Levita, and as found elsewhere.

3. The town of Tiberias on the Lake of Capernaum was the chief seat of Jewish learning, where Massoretic studies were pursued. After the return from Exile it is likely that there were scribes devoted

to the work of preserving and copying the Sacred Scriptures. Such duties probably formed part of the work of "the scribes" so often alluded to in the New Testament. The overthrow of the Jewish state by the Romans put an end to all such arrangements, and it is impossible to tell on what authority the statements rest which are made in the Talmud as to the work of the earlier scribes. R. Judah the Holy (A.D. 200) committed to writing the Mishna, in order to preserve from utter destruction that great body of oral law, which had hitherto been handed down for centuries solely by word of mouth. In the fourth century it was further found necessary to commit to writing the Gemara, or commentary on the Mishna, parts of which are as old, and even occasionally older than the Mishna itself. It was several centuries after the Christian era ere the Jewish scholars became reconciled to the practice of committing anything to writing except the Scriptures themselves. Their laws, traditions, and expositions were all handed down orally. Hence it is not surprising that no written records exist detailing the work of the Massoretic scholars. See Bloch, *Studien zur Gesch. der heb. Lit.*, p. 120 ff., and my *Koheleth*, Excursus iii., p. 484. See *Appendix*.

4. Ben Asher, who lived in the tenth century, and whose family lived at Tiberias in the eighth century, is said to have left behind him a Hebrew codex, affirmed to have been the main source from whence the present Massoretic text is derived. Ben Naphtali somewhat earlier wrote also a model codex of the Hebrew Bible. A few scanty remains exist of the differences between

the readings of Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali. Some of these affect the consonants of the text, such as Jer. xi. 7, where Ben Naphtali reads עֲדָה for וְעַד ; Jer. xxix. 22, where he reads וּכְאֶחָיו for וּכְאֶחָב . Most of them, however, only affect the punctuation.

See Strack's *Prolegomena*. Baer and Strack, *Dikduke hatteamim*, 1879. Berliner, *Targ. Onkelos*, 1884; ii. 139. On the Babylonian punctuation, in addition to works already mentioned in ch. iv. 6, see Pinsker, *Einführung in d. Babyl. Heb. Punctationsystem*, 1863; Graetz, *Monatschrift*, 1881.

The history of the Massorah in general, in addition to the works mentioned in ch. iii. 6, 8; iv. 5, is treated by Geiger in his *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, iii., 78 pp., and in his *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, 1857; by Strack in the *Prot. Realencycl.*, 2nd edition, ix., 388 ff. See also the *Sefer Tora* printed in Kirchheim's *VII Libri Talm. parvi Hierosol.*, 1851; Müller, *Masechet Soferim*, 1878. Frensdorf, *Das Buch Ochla w'ochla*, 1864; his *Massora Magna*, 1876, is unfortunately unfinished. Ginsburg's great folio work, *The Massorah—compiled from MSS. alphabetically and lexically arranged*, is not yet completed, although vol. i. appeared in 1880, vol. ii. completing the Massorah in 1883, and a supplementary vol. to vol. iii. in 1885. Vol. iii. itself has not yet appeared, but is partly in the press, and likely to appear in a year or so. S. Baer is publishing an amended Massoretic text in the Rabbinical Bible, *Mikra Gadhol*, Wilna. See also two very able articles on "The Rise and Development of the Massorah," by Rev. I. Harris, M.A., in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* Jan. and April, 1889. See Appendix.

5. The object of the Massoretic scholars was, as far as possible, to preserve the text as they received it. They did not venture to correct the text, even in places where its blunders were most distinctly ascertained. But although they thus preserved in many places inferior readings in the text, noting it

as כתיב, written (*Kethibh*), they introduced into the margin what they would have substituted in their place, as קרי, read (*K'rē* or *Q'rē*, see *App.*). In all these cases, without exception, it must be remembered the word that stands in the text is regarded as left absolutely unpointed, the vowel points and accents belonging only to that found in the margin. It should be noted that several of these *K'rē* readings are often mentioned in the Talmud, and that therefore a portion at least of those notes belong to a period prior to the invention of the Hebrew vowel points.

Of the *K'rē* notes as found in the present Hebrew Bible there are various kinds. Sometimes (1) vowels and accents are written without any consonants, the consonants to which they belong being given in the margin. See 2 Sam. viii. 2, xvi. 23; Jer. xxxi. 38. (2) Consonants stand in the text without vowels, the word so marked being in the margin directed to be passed over entirely. See Jer. li. 3; Ezek. xlviii. 16; Ruth iii. 12. (3) Sometimes the *K'rē* directs what is written in the text as one word to be divided into two, e.g. Ps. x. 10, חָלְכָאִים is to be read (4) In other cases two words are directed to be read as one, e.g. בַּעֲנִים in Lam. iv. 3 as פִּעְנִים. (5) There are words whose last letter belongs to the following word, e.g. 2 Sam. v. 2, in הִיְתָה מוֹצִיא in 2 Sam. xxi. 12, where שְׁמָה פָּלֶשֶׁתִים must be read, instead of שֵׁם הָפָלֶשֶׁתִים. (6) Euphemistic expressions were directed to be substituted in reading for the coarser expressions which occur in the original.

It is important to observe that there are words to which a *K'rē perpetuum* is always to be supplied.

E.g. הָיוּ, fem., in the Pentateuch, is intended always to be read הִיא. The letters may also be read הָוֹא, but in no case is it to be pronounced as printed. Similarly, יהוה was never intended to be pronounced *Jehovah*, which is not Hebrew. The name is written indeed יְהֹוָה, but the vowels are those of אֲדֹנֵי, *Lord*, which is directed to be read instead. When the combination “the Lord Jehovah” occurs, in which the word אֲדֹנֵי precedes יהוה, the vowels of אֱלֹהִים, *God*, are then substituted, and יהוה is vocalised יְהֹוָה, as the name אֱלֹהִים is to be read in its place. This unwillingness to pronounce the sacred name, the true vocalisation of which is probably יְהֹוָה, or יְהֹוָתָה, is at least as old as the LXX. version, in which Κύριος is always substituted for it (see chap. viii., 8), and the same usage has been retained in the English versions, where LORD or GOD, as the case may be, printed in small capitals stands for *Jahaveh* or *Jahveh*. Instances of the former occur everywhere in the English versions; more rarely the latter, see Isa. lxi. 11. On the name see Driver, “Recent Theories on the Origin and Nature of the Tetragrammaton,” in *Studia Biblica*, Oxford, 1885.

found at the close of the Hebrew Bible. The sections of the Law or Pentateuch were originally one hundred and fifty-four, designed for a three years' course of reading. In the present Hebrew Bibles they are fifty-four in number, arranged for a yearly cycle. These larger sections are subdivided into smaller, designated פתווחות, “open,” and marked with single ס, or with a single ס (סתומות, “closed”), the differences between the two having reference mainly, though perhaps not exclusively, to the calligraphy of the text, are by no means strictly observed in the printed Hebrew Bibles. The *open* sections are chief divisions, the *closed* generally subdivisions. But there were other differences also indicated by such sections. The verse division was a later introduction of the same scholars.

7. A considerable number of other points connected with the Massorah must be here passed over in silence. The labour undergone in the numbering of the letters and the notation of the middle letters and middle words in each book subserved no useful purpose. It did not preserve the text from corruption. The Massoretic lists of parallel passages and peculiarities are, on the other hand, important. The use of *literæ majuscule* (as in Gen. xxxiv. 31), *minuscule* (e.g. Gen. ii. 4), *suspensæ* (Judg. xviii. 30), *inversæ* (Num. x. 35, 36), with many other peculiarities of a similar nature, were designed for critical purposes of various kinds, which in some cases have been discovered, while in other cases their real significance has been hopelessly lost. The puerilities about these matters mentioned by Buxtorf in his *Tiberias*, are in many cases mere “conceits” of a later age.

The *puncta extraordinaria*, which are of far older date than the Massoretic period, have been in some cases explained as simple signs of correction on the part of the scribes. There is much to be said in favour of this view. For similar points occur in Samaritan MSS. with that signification, and some of the words so pointed in Hebrew MSS. are omitted in the ancient versions. But although some such use was subserved by those dots, the explanation cannot yet be absolutely accepted. For it must be observed that MSS. are by no means uniform in that particular, the *puncta extraordinaria* occurring more frequently in some MSS. than in others. Strack's *Proleg. Crit. in Vet. Test. Heb.*, 1873, which gives much information on such points, ought to be in the hands of every Biblical student.

8. The order of the various Books seems to have been finally settled by the Massoretes. The Hebrew Bible is divided into three parts: (1) The *Torah*, "Law" or Pentateuch. (2) The *Prophets*, divided into two, (a) the *former*, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings; (b) the *later*, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, with the twelve Minor Prophets. (3) The *Kethubim*, or the "Writings," generally termed the Hagiographa, viz. Psalms, Proverbs, Job, the five Megilloth or *Rolls* (*i.e.* Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther), Daniel, Ezra-Nehemiah, and Chronicles. The order of the Books in the English Bible is that of the Latin Vulgate, with the Apocryphal Books excluded. The Massorah reckons the Books as twenty-four, the two books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles being counted as single books; the twelve

Minor Prophets are reckoned as one book, and Ezra and Nehemiah are also regarded as forming together one book. The English Bible regards the books as thirty-nine. Josephus and the Alexandrine writers reckon only twenty-two, Ruth with Judges being counted as one, and Lamentations being included in Jeremiah. The arrangement in the Talmud (*Baba Bathra*, 14b) is:—*Law*; *Prophets*, i.e. Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah, and the Twelve; *Writings*, i.e. Ruth, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Koheleth, Canticles, Lamentations, Daniel, Esther, Ezra-Nehemiah, Chronicles. But the latter order is of very doubtful authority. See Bloch, *Studien*; Wright, *Koheleth*, Excurs. i. The size of the respective books, as ascertained by the pages actually occupied by each, was evidently the principle which determined the order in which the books of the *Prophets* were placed according to this arrangement.

CHAPTER VI.

THE TARGUMS.

1. THE intercourse—sometimes of a friendly, and more often of a hostile character—which from the earliest times took place between Israel and their Aramaic-speaking neighbours, caused Aramaic to be generally understood, not only by members of the tribes belonging to the northern kingdom, but also by the higher classes belonging to the southern kingdom (*Isa. xxxvi. 11*, etc.). The Western Aramaic gradually became more general among the Israelites after the Exile, although the Israelites did not learn, as is often supposed that language in Babylon. Western Aramaic was, indeed, incorrectly termed “Chaldee,” through a misconception of *Dan. i. 4* with *ii. 4*. Jerome popularised the mistake, which he no doubt imbibed from his Jewish teachers; and accordingly many, from his days onward, have supposed that the astrologers (or Chaldaeans) at the court of Nebuchadnezzar addressed that king in Aramaic, which was sometimes regarded as having been the language of Babylonia. See our remarks on the Book of Daniel, p. 193.

2. After the Exile Aramaic became the language of trade and commerce in Palestine, and a consider-

able number of the Jews after a time were more familiar with it than with the sacred tongue. Hence the practice arose of accompanying the reading of the Scriptures in the synagogues by an interpretation in the popular Aramaic. Neh. viii. 8 is often incorrectly adduced in proof of this practice. For the Jewish theologians of the Middle Ages were anxious to cite Scripture authority for all their arrangements and institutions, even for those which came into existence subsequent to the Persian period, just as Christian divines have similarly attempted to establish dogmas and practices of latter development from passages of the New Testament, which, rightly understood, have no such meaning. Luke iv. 17 ff. is often adduced to prove that the practice of interpreting the Scriptures in Aramaic was at least not universal in the time of our Lord. That practice may, however, then have been in use in parts of the country, and it was firmly established as a general custom before the great insurrection in the days of Hadrian. The Aramaic paraphrase sometimes adhered closely to the original text, but at other times was embellished with additions of various kinds. The reader of the Law and the Prophets in reading was forbidden to add anything to the sacred text, or to repeat any text from memory. He was directed when reading strictly to keep his eyes on the words. The Meturgeman, or Translator, was, on the other hand, forbidden to make any use whatever of manuscript but was wholly to depend on memory. Comp. J. H. Biesenthal, *Das Trostschreiben an die Hebräer*, Einl., cap. v., p. 50 ff.

3. All “interpretations”—and the word Targum (תַּرְגּוּם) properly signifies such—have a tendency, whether more or less literal, in the process of time to become uniform. The interpreters among the Jews became in time a sort of guild. While, therefore, Böhl has gone too far in maintaining that there was in existence in our Lord’s time an Aramaic translation or paraphrase of the Scriptures, which was cited by New Testament writers, it is not improbable that large portions of the Scripture in Aramaic were early committed to writing. The Talmud (*Shabbath*, 115a, towards the end) mentions a written Targum on the Book of Job towards the close of the first century, in the days of Gamaliel. The antipathy of that patriarch to such a work was so great, that he ordered it to be buried under the foundations of a wall; and, according to the Jer. Talmud (*Shabbath*, xvi. 15c), the order was forthwith executed. But if a written Targum on Job was extant so early, it is only reasonable to suppose that other Targums were also in existence.

4. The theology set forth in the Targums proves, as Strack observes, their great antiquity. None, however, of the Targums now known are of higher antiquity than the third or fourth centuries after Christ. But they are based to a large extent upon similar works of a much higher antiquity.

5. The extant Targums are: (1) *The Targum of Onkelos* (אוֹנְקָלּוֹס), which is the most literal, and comprehends the entire Pentateuch. It is uncertain who this Onkelos was, or at what time he lived. The Onkelos spoken of in the Talmud as contem-

porary with Gamaliel, and whose translations are there mentioned, can be identified with Aquila (אֲקִילָה), the Greek translator (see p. 60). Geiger is probably correct in maintaining that the Targum which adhered most literally to the Hebrew text was called that of Onkelos, not because it was edited by him, but as indicating that it was executed with something like the same literality for which Aquila's Greek version was remarkable. The name describes the nature of the work, and not the author. The Targum of Onkelos does not appear to have been the work of a single author or editor, but the production of a school. In its present shape it probably originated in Babylon, and it has often been questioned whether that Targum is as early as the older portions of the two Targums next to be mentioned.

(2) *The Targum of Jerusalem*, I., embraces the Pentateuch, and is commonly known as the *Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan*, owing to the fact that it was incorrectly ascribed to Jonathan ben Uzziel, the pupil of Hillel, a mistake which probably arose from an incorrect explanation of the abbreviation 'נ, which indicates תרגום ירושלמי. In its present form it is probably not older than the seventh century.

(3) *The Targum of Jerusalem*, II., also termed the *Fragmentary Targum*, embraces only portions of the Pentateuch. It is older than the former, and probably a production of the Palestinian school. It contains more of an Haggadic, *i.e.* homiletic nature. This Targum is often cited in the Jerusalem Talmud and in the Midrash Rabba.

(4) The Targum of Jonathan embraces the Prophets.

This paraphrase is generally ascribed to Jonathan ben Uzziel, who, according to the Babylonian Talmud (*Megillah*, 3a), composed a Targum on the Prophets. Passages, however, of this Targum are ascribed in the Talmud to a later scholar, R. Joseph bar Chiyyah (died 333), who may have revised and re-edited the Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel. The name Jonathan was a common one. Geiger has conjectured that Jonathan is a Hebraised form of Theodotion (see chap. viii.), both names being of the same signification. In this case the name indicates the manner in which the Targum was composed. It is likely that this Targum also was the product of a school of interpreters, and not the work of any single author.

(5) The Targums on the Hagiographa (chap. v., 8) were composed by different authors, and are more modern. The authors of those paraphrases probably worked also on the lines of former translators. No Targum is extant on the Books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Daniel, while there are two Targums on the Book of Esther. According to Nöldeke, the Targum on the Proverbs is a Jewish working-up of the Syriac (Peshitto) translation. The same might also be affirmed of the Targum on the Psalms, which, from its allusions in the rendering of Psalm cviii. 11 to Rome and Constantinople as the two capitals of the world, has been considered to have been composed prior to A.D. 476; while, on the other hand, the references to the Hungarians in Psalm lxxxiii. 7 point to the ninth century. Such phenomena seem to show that the translation of the Psalms was the work of very different periods.

(6) Besides the above, a few fragments are extant of other Targums on the Prophets, which need here only be alluded to.

6. See Nöldeke, *Die alt-testamentliche Literatur*, 1868, and his articles in Merx' *Archiv f. wiss. Erforschung d. A. T.* ii., and in the *Zeitschrift d. deutsch. Morgenl. Ges.*, xxii. (1868), p. 443 ff.; Zunz, *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*, 1832. Geiger, *Urschrift*, 1857; *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, 1871, 1874; *Nachgelassene Schrift*. iv. Berliner, *Targum Onkelos*, (2 vols., text and notes), 1884; also his *Massorah zum Targum Onkelos*, 1877. Seligsohn, *De duabus Hierosol. Pent. paraph.*, 1859. G. B. Winer, *De Onkeloso ejusq. paraph. Chald.*, 1820, and his *De Jonathanis in Pent. paraph. Chald.*, 1823, H. Petermann, *De duabus Pent. paraph. Chald.*, 1829. S. D. Luzzatto, *Philoxenus sive de Onkelosi chald. Pent. vers.*, 1830. R. Anger, *De Onkelo Chald. quem ferunt Pent. paraph. et quid ei rationis intercedat cum Akila græco V. T. interprete*, 1845, 1846. S. Gronemann, *Die Jonathanische Pent.-Uebersetzung in ihrem Verhältnisse zur Halacha*, 1879. Sal. Singer, *Onkelos u. das Verhältniss seines Targ. zur Halacha*, 1881. W. Bächer, on Targ. on Pent. in *Zeitschrift d. D. M. G.*, xxviii. (1874), also in same, vol. xxix. (1875); on the Targ. to Psalms in Graetz, *Monatschrift* 1872, and on that on *Job* in Graetz, *Monatschrift*, 1871. Reis on Targ. to Esther in same journal for 1876 and 1881. M. Rosenberg and K. Kohler, *Das Targum zur Chronik*, *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, 1870.

7. The Targums are given in the Rabb. Bibles and with Latin translations in the Polyglotts (chap. ii. 3). Many separate editions have also appeared. Lagarde issued an unpointed edit. of *Prophetæ Chaldaice* (Josh.—2 Kings with Isaiah—Mal.), 1872, followed by *Hagiographa Chaldaice*, 1873. For Berliner's *Onkelos*, see former paragraph. The Targ. on *Chronicles* was first issued by Beck in Augsburg, 1680, afterwards by Wilkins, Amsterdam, 1715. The Targ. of Onkelos has been often reprinted in a cheap form with the Heb. text of the Pent., and Rashi's comm., e.g. in 5 small vols, Schlesinger, Wien, 1878. L. Munk has issued in 1876 the *Targum schenckii*

zum B. Esther with various readings and notes. Paulus Cassel in *Das Buch Esther*, 1878, has given a translation of the same. (See under *Esther*.) The Targ. on *Ruth* with variants is given by C. H. H. Wright. (See under *Ruth*.) All the Targums on the Pent. have been translated into English by J. W. Etheridge and published in two thick vols. in 1862 and 1865. C. W. H. Pauli has also published an English translation of the Targ. on Isaiah, in 1871. A Latin translation of the Jerus. Targ. was published by F. Tayler, London, 1649, and the same scholar published a similar translation of both Targums to the Book of Esther in 1655.

8. The Aramaic is divided into two branches : (1) the *Western*, which comprehends (*a*) the Samaritan, (*b*) the Biblical Aramaic, and (*c*) the Targumic, the two latter being popularly though erroneously termed Chaldee, (*d*) Nabatæan, extant in numerous inscriptions and coins. (2) The *Eastern* Aramaic, comprehends (*a*) Syriac, (*b*) the language of the Babylonian Talmud, and (*c*) Mandäic, spoken in lower Babylonia. Other important remains of Aramaic are mentioned by Kautzs̄h in the introduction to his *Grammatik des biblisch-Aramäischen*, 1884. The Hebrew student can easily obtain a knowledge of Biblical Aramaic through the *Chaldaismi Biblici adumbratio* prefixed to Baer and Delitzsch's ed. of *Libri Danielis, Ezrae et Neh.*, 1882. S. D. Luzzatto, *Elements of Bibl. Chaldee and of the dial. of the Talmud* was published in Italian in 1865, in German 1873, and in English by J. S. Goldammer, 1877. G. B. Winer's *Gramm. des bibl. und targ. Chald.*, 2nd edit., 1842 (edit. by Fischer, 1882), is the basis of Rigg's *Chaldee Manual*, 1832, later edit. 1858, an'l of Longfield's *Grammar*, etc., 1859. The paradigms in the latter unfortunately abound in typographical blunders. Turpie's *Chald. Manual* appeared in 1879. J. H. Petermann's, *Brevis ling. chald. gramm. litt. chrestom. cum glos.*, 2nd edit., 1872, is useful. The best grammar for Bibl. Chaldee is that of Kautzs̄h, English transl. by Stenhouse. Important is Ad. Merx, *Bemerkungen über die Vocalisation der Targume* (Verhandl. des 5 internat. Orient. Congr., ii. 1, pp. 142-188). Merx has carried out the principles there indicated in his *Chrest. Targumica*, 1888, noticed p. 28.

The Lexicons are : J. Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald. Talm. et Rabb.*, fol., 1639. New reprint with additions by B. Fischer, 2 vols., 1869 and 1874. Rabb. Dr. J. Levy, *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim*, etc., 2 vols., 1867, 1868, reprint in one vol., 1881. Most important is J. Levy, *Neuheb. et Chald. Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim, nebst Beiträgen von Prof. Dr. H. L. Fleischer*, vol. i., 1876 ; vol. ii., 1879 ; vol. iii., 1883 ; vol. iv., 1889. Useful chrestomathies are : G. B. Winer *Chald. Lesebuch aus den Targg.*, 2 Aufl., by J. Fürst, 1864 ; J. Kaerle, *Chrest. Targ.-Syr.*, 1852 (299 pp.), Merx, see p. 28. For Talmudic : B. Fischer, *Talmud. Chrestomathie*, 268 pp., H. L. Strack's useful editt. of *Pirke Aboth*, 2te Aufl., Berlin, H. Reuther, 1888 ; *'Aboda Zara*, 1888 ; *Joma*, 1888 ; *Shabbath*, 1890 ; also Geiger, *Lehr- und Lesebuch zur Sprache der Mishnah*, 1845 ; Strack and Siegfried, *Lehrb. der Neuheb. Sprache und Litt.*, 1884.

Ed. Böhl's works referred to on p. 42 are : *Forschungen nach einer Volksbibel zur Zeit Jesu*, Wien, 1873 ; and, as a second vol. of that work, *Die Alt-testamentlichen Citate im Neuen Test.*, Wien, 1878.

9. The Samaritan translation of the Pentateuch is carefully to be distinguished from the Samaritan codex of the Pentateuch noticed before, p. 19. The Samaritan codex is simply a Hebrew codex of a different recension from the Massoretic, and written in the Samaritan character, which, though by no means so important as formerly imagined, is still of considerable value. But the Samaritan version is in reality a Samaritan Targum based on the Samaritan codex, and possesses peculiar value. The Fathers of the third and fourth centuries speak of a Σαμαρειτικόν, or Greek translation of this version, which is therefore of considerable antiquity. See Field's *Hexapla*, i., p. lxxxiii.

The best helps to Samaritan are : F. Uhlemann, *Institutiones ling. Samaritanæ*, 1837, containing an extensive chrestomathy. J. H. Petermann, *Breris ling. Sam. gramm. litt. chrest. cum gloss.*, 1873. The literature given in the Porta Ling Orient., especially as re-edited by Strack, will also be found of considerable utility.

The Sam. version is to be found in the Polyglotts, see chap. ii. 3. More modern editions are, Brüll, *Gesch. u. Lit.*, 1876; *Das Samaritanische Targ. z. Pent.*, with various readings and app., 1875, 1879; *Varianten zu Genesis des Sam. Targ.*, 1876, both in Hebrew characters. J. W. Nutt, *Fragments of a Sam. Targum*, 1874. J. H. Petermann, *Pent. Sam.* in Samaritan characters : *Fasc. i. Gen.*, 1872 ; *ii. Exod.*, 1882 ; *iii. Lev.*, ed. Vollers, 1883 ; *iv. Numb.*, ex recens. Vollers, 1885. Important are : H. Petermann, *Versuch einer heb. Formenlehre nach der Aussprache der heutig. Samaritaner nebst einer dar-nach gebild. Transscription der Genesis, und . . . Lesarten der Samaritaner*, 1868 ; M. Heidenheim, *Die Sam. Pent. Vers. Genesis in der heb. Quadratschrift, mit Einl. u. Scholien*, 1884. Kohn, *Samaritanische Studien*, 1868. Also his *Zur Sprache, Lit. u. Dogmatik*, 1876 (reviewed by Nöldeke, *Zeitschrift d. D. M. G.*, 1876, p. 343 ff); also in *Zeitschrift der D. M. G.*, 1885. Kuennen has published Abu Said's Arabic translation, *Lib. Gen. sec. Arab. Pent. vers.*, 1851 ; *Exod. u. Lev.*, 1854.

CHAPTER VII.

THE SYRIAC VERSIONS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. THE oldest Syriac version is that known as the Peshitto, פְשִׁיטָה, Ἡεξαπλοῦ i.e. the simple, or (as explained by Nestle and Strack) generally used version. The term occurs in Syriac Massoretic MSS. of the ninth and tenth centuries (*Nöldeke*), and was so named to distinguish it from the Hexaplar version. The Peshitto is of Judæo-Christian origin, and is as old as the second or third centuries. The translation was the work of several scholars, and the portions are of very different merit. The Pentateuch is the best-translated portion. The translators made considerable use of the LXX.; but it is not improbable that their translation was corrected here and there in later times, and so approximates more nearly to the LXX. than it did originally. Strack observes that the translation of the Chronicles is essentially different from that of the other books. Nöldeke considers that the cause of this is that the Nestorians and some of the Monophysites did not include in their canon the Books of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther. It is to be observed, however, that Aphraates, who flourished in the second

quarter of the fourth century, cites all those books as canonical. A list of the numerous Scripture quotations in Aphraates is given in W. Wright's edition of the *Homilies of Aphraates* in Syriac, vol. i., 1869. As the English translation of this work, promised by Professor Wright as vol. ii., has unfortunately never appeared, it may be well to observe that a German translation of Aphraates by George Bert has been published in von Gebhardt and Harnack's *Texte u. Untersuch. zur Gesch. d. Alt. Christl. Lit.*, Band iii., Heft 3, 4, 1888, which contains also a list of the Biblical quotations. The Apocryphal books form no part of the Peshitto proper, but are a later addition thereto, although those books are contained in old MSS.

2. The Peshitto version is given in full in both the Paris and London Polyglotts, accompanied by a Latin version. S. Lee published in 1824 the whole version of both Old and New Testaments, which is the edition sold by the British and Foreign Bible Society. That edition is for the most part not vocalized in the Old Testament. The American missionaries have published a fully pointed edition at Urmia, 1852. Single portions have been often edited, such as the Pent. by G. G. Kirsch, 1787, the Psalms by Erpenius in 1625; and with Latin notes (phil. et crit.) by Dathe, 1768; there is also a pointed edition of the same by British and Foreign Bible Society; and by Nestle in *Psalt. Tetraglott., Græc., Syr., Chald., Lat.*, 1879; where the texts are however unpointed. Ceriani, *Transl. Syra Pescitto V. T. ex cod. Ambros.*, 3 parts, fol., 1876-79; de Lagarde, *Libb. V. T. Apoc. Syr.*, 1861. See L. Hirzel, *De Pent. Vers. Syr. indole*, 1825. Credner, *De Proph. Min. vers. Syr. . . . indole*, 1827. N. Wiseman, *Horæ Syr.*, Rom., 1828. Perles, *Meletemat. Pesch.*, 1859. Janichs, *Animadv. crit. in vers. syr. Koh. et Ruth*, 1871. Prager, *De V. T. vers.*

syr. quæst. crit., Pars I., 1875. Nöldeke, *Alt-test. Lit.*, 1868. S. Fränkel, *Die Syr. Uebersetzung zu den Bb. der Chron. in Jahrbb. f. Prot. Theol.*, 1879. Baethgen, *Untersuchungen über die Psalmen*, *Jahrbb. f. Prot. Theol.*, 1882. See under head of *Psalms*.

2. The Hexaplar Syriac is a translation of the LXX. version, and of great importance in all questions bearing on that version. Its author was Paul, Bishop of Tella, A.D. 616-618. Norberg published in 1787 Jeremiah and Ezekiel after this version, and H. Middeldorp has published *Cod. Syr. Hexapl. lib. iv. Reg., e cod. Paris*, also *Jer., xii. Proph. Min., Prov., Job, Cant., Threni, Eccl., e cod. Mediol. ed. et comm. illustr.*, 1835. T. Skat Rördam published *Libri Judicum et Ruth sec. vers. Syr.-Hexapl.*, 1861.

On the most ancient Syriac MSS. see Ceriani, *Memorie del R. Inst. Lomb. di Scienze e Lett.*, Ser. iii., vol. xi., 2. W. Wright's *Catalogue of Syriac MSS. in British Museum*, 1870. The most complete account of Syriac literature is W. Wright's article in the *Encycl. Britannica*, vol. xxii. See the sketch in Eb. Nestle's *Syrische Grammatik mit Litt. Chrest. u. Gloss.*, 2nd ed., 1888. An English translation has been issued by A. R. S. Kennedy, 1889. Among the principal modern Syriac grammars are that of Uhlemann, 1829, 2nd ed., 1857; Engl. trans. by Hutchinson, New York and Edinb., 1854. A. T. Hoffmann, *Gram. Syr.*, Libb. iii., 1827. Ad. Merx, *Gramm. Syr.*, Pars i., 1867; Pars ii., 1870, not yet completed. Th. Nöldeke, *Kurzgefasst. Syr. Grammatik*, 1880. In English: Phillips, *Elements of Syr. Gramm.*, 3rd ed., 1866. B. H. Cowper, *Syriac Gramm.*, 1858. In French: R. Duval, *Traité de Grammaire Syriaque*, Paris, 1881. On the Syriac Massora, see Wiseman, *Horæ Syr.*, 1828; M. l'abbé Martin, *Tradition Karkaphienne, ou la Massore chez les Syriens*, Paris, 1870; *Hist. de la Punet., ou la Massore chez les Syriens* 1875. The Lexicons are: Castell, *Lex. Syr. cur.* J. H. Michaelis, 1788.

The lexicon attached to Kirsch's *Chrest Syr. cum'lex.*, ed. by G. H. Bernstein, 1832, 1836, is most useful to supplement the former. R. Payne Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus*, is not yet quite completed (vol. i., 1879, vol. 2, fasc. vi., 1883, vii., 1886, viii., 1890 to end of ፲.)

The other Oriental versions, such as the Arabic, Persian and Ethiopic, are of very secondary importance, and must here be passed over.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE GREEK VERSIONS.

1. *THE Septuagint.* The most important of the ancient versions is the Alexandrian Greek translation, generally designated the LXX., and in former times sometimes the LXXII. The name is popularly explained by the legend in the apocryphal Letter of Aristeas to Philocrates, namely, that at the suggestion of Demetrius Phalereus, librarian at Alexandria, king Ptolemy Philadelphus (B.C. 286-246) requested Eleazar, the high priest at Jerusalem, to procure a Greek translation of the Jewish Law for the Royal Library at Alexandria. Aristeas gives an interesting description of the temple at Jerusalem and its cultus. In accordance with the request, Eleazar sent down to Egypt six men selected out of each tribe, seventy-two in all, who, in the Isle of Pharos, translated the Pentateuch from a MS. written in golden letters upon parchment. The translation was performed in seventy-two days, was highly praised by the Alexandrine Jews, and the translators returned laden with gifts to their own land. The legend afterwards received amplifications, viz. that the translators were shut up in separate cells, that they translated the whole Bible, and that they

produced each a translation, which on examination proved to be word for word identical.

The Greek text of Aristeas' Letter is given in Havercamp's edit. of Josephus, 1726, but the text there and elsewhere given is corrupt. It has been critically edited by M. Schmidt, in Merx' *Archiv*, Band i., pp. 241-312 (1869). The Letter was known to Josephus, who has misunderstood and misrepresented some of its statements. The Greek is in many places difficult. A translation into German is to be found in O. Waldeck, *Volksausgabe des jüd.-hellenistischen Schriftthums der drei vorchristl. Jahrh.*, 1885. See on Aristeas, Nöldeke, *Alt. Test. Litteratur*, p. 109 ff., and Papageorgios, *Ueber den Aristeasbrief*, 1880, Schürer, *Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes*, see App.

Aristobulus, a Jewish philosopher (who wrote an Ἐξήγησις τῆς Μωσέως γραφῆς, quoted by Eusebius and Clem. Alex.), speaks of the Law having been translated into Greek in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and of Demetrius Phalereus having been employed on the work. There are certain difficulties with respect to Aristobulus' story, which does not correspond with that of Aristeas, although it points to the same tradition. Aristobulus was probably teacher of Philometor, and lived in the commencement of the second century before Christ.

See Hody, *De Bibl. textibus orig.*, 1705. Valckenaer, *Diatribé de Aristobulo Judæo*, 1806. Schürer, *Gesch. des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 2te Ausg. 1886, 1889. Graetz, *Monatschrift*, 1876. Joel, *Blicke in die Religions-Gesch. zum Anfang des zweit. christl. Jahrh.*, 1880.

However distorted the legend, it is certain that the translation of the LXX. originated in Egypt, and in the time of the early Ptolemies received general recog-

nition (see *App.*). The Jews in Egypt, whose numbers were increased by the transportation of thousands thither in b.c. 320, soon lost all familiarity with their own language. The Law was probably interpreted very early into Greek in their synagogues, just as in other places it had been interpreted into Aramaic. All such translations had a tendency to become fixed, and after a while, for practical purposes, were committed to writing. The Pentateuch was the first portion translated, and the translation of the other books followed in due time as a matter of course. A Greek translation of all the books was in existence prior to the composition of the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach, or Ecclesiasticus, in the prologue to which book reference is made to such a translation. It is, however, a matter of dispute whether Sirach's work is to be assigned to a date so early as b.c. 237-211, or to be brought down so late as b.c. 132. The title "LXX." was probably given to the Greek translation of the Holy Scriptures, because, when issued, the translation met with approval, and received the sanction of the Jewish Sanhedrin. The number, "seventy-two," sprang from the conviction that such a work must have been the work of all Israel. But the sanction of the Sanhedrin was withdrawn, probably in consequence of the reaction against everything Greek, consequent on the events of the Maccabean era (b.c. 175-135). The execution of a Greek translation at the request of king Ptolemy is noticed in the Talmud, although the number of the translators is there reduced to five, and the birthday of the translation is stigmatised as a day as fatal to Israel

as that on which the golden calf was made. Hence the fast day appointed on the 8th of the month of Tebeth. Comp. *Mas. Soferim*, 1, and the notes in Dr. J. Müller's edition, *Megillah*, 3a, *Megillath Taanith*, 9a.

2. The LXX. Version was the production of a number of translators. The Pentateuch is the best portion translated; next Job and Proverbs. Jeremiah has been treated with peculiar freedom, and possibly rests upon another recension of the Hebrew text. The Book of Daniel is the worst, though peculiarly important from an exegetical point of view. The LXX. translation of that book was, since the days of Irenæus and Hippolytus, supplanted by the version of Theodotion, and was only brought to light again about a century ago.

The literature on the LXX. is very extensive, and only a few works can be mentioned. On Morinus' work see p. 3 ; on Hody, p. 54. Most important are: Frankel's *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, 1841 ; Geiger's *Urschrift* (see p. 34) ; his *Nachgelassene Schriften*, iv. 73 ff. ; Th. Studer, *De vers. Alex. orig. usu et abusu*, 1823 ; Eb. Nestle, *Septuaginta Studien*, 1886 ; the articles in the various Bibl. Dictionaries, C. Siegfried, *Philo und der überlieferte Text der LXX.* in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift*, 1873. The following scholars have written on the LXX. transl. of the various books of O. T. : *Pent.*, Thiersch, 1841 ; *Joshua*, Hollenberg, 1876 ; *Judges and Ruth*, Fritzsche, 1864, 1867 ; *Samuel*, Thenius, Wellhausen and Dryer ; *Isaiah*, A. Scholz, 1880 ; *Jeremiah*, Wichelhaus, 1847 ; A. Scholz, 1875 ; Kühl, 1882 ; Workman, 1889 ; *Ezekiel*, A. Merx, *Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.*, 1883 ; Cornill, see under *Ezekiel* ; *Minor Proph.*, Völlers, *Das Dodeka-prop. d. Alex.*, 1880, and in Stade's *Theol.*, 1882 ; *Proverbs*, Lagarde, 1863 ; Graetz, *Monatschrift*, 1884 ; *Job*, Bickell, 1862 (see *App.*) ; *Eccles.*, Freudenthal,

Hellenist. Studien, 1875. Grinfield's *Apol. for the LXX.*, 1850, is interesting.

The value of the LXX. is great, but the facts already mentioned show that in the correction of the Hebrew text it must be used with great caution. Much remains to be done ere the very text of that version can be said to be fairly settled.

3. The editions of the LXX. are mentioned in all the larger Biblical Dictionaries. The text in the Complutensian Polyglott has been ascertained to be in the main that of Lucian's recension, based, however, upon MSS. of no great antiquity. The Roman edition (issued under the authority of Sixtus V., and known as the Sixtine) was based mainly upon the Vatican codex, although by no means an accurate representation of that MS. The London Polyglott in general follows its text. The Oxford edition of J. E. Grabe, published in four folios (1707-1720), was mainly based on the Alexandrian codex. The great edition of Holmes and Parsons, in five folios (1798-1827), gives a valuable collation of various readings, though deficient in accuracy and arrangement.

The small quarto edition of L. Bos (1709) is useful, because with numerous variants it also contains the readings of the other Greek translations. It must, however, be used with caution. Tischendorf's edition was first published in 1850. Though less ambitious than that of Holmes and Parsons, and although it does not give so many variants as Bos, it is far in advance of both editions. It follows the Sixtine, but contains variants of the uncials. The second edition was published in 1856 with the Chigi Daniel (see

p. 60), and the fifth was published after the death of Tischendorf in 1875. E. Nestle edited the sixth edition in 1880, and a seventh edition in 1887. Both contain a valuable supplement by Nestle, issued also separately, which gives a more complete collation of the Sixtine text with the Vatican, Alexandrian, and Sinaitic texts, etc. Dr. H. B. Swete, now Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, published in 1887 the first volume (Gen.—IV. Kings) of a manual edition of *The Old Testament in Greek according to the LXX.* edited for the Syndics of the University Press, with the variants of the most important uncial MSS. The second volume, containing 1 Chron. to Tobit, is now (1891) published. A larger and more important edition is in preparation. An English translation of the LXX. has been published, *The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament, with an English Translation, Various Readings, and Critical Notes.* London: S. Bagster and Sons. All such works must be used with caution.

A facsimile of the Alex. MS., the uncial of the fifth century known as A., was first published by H. H. Baber, 3 vols. fol. 1816-21, and more satisfactorily in autotype under edit. of E. M. Thompson; vol. 1, Gen.-2 Chr., 1881; vol. 2, Hos.-4th Macc., 1883; vol. iii., Ps.-Eccl., 1883, completing the O. T. The N. T. was published in 1879. The facsimile edit. of the Vatican MS., the uncial of the fourth century known as B., which was prepared by Card. Mai, was finally published at Rome, under the editorship of C. Vercellone and J. Cozza, the O. T. in four vols., 1869-1872; vol. v., containing the N. T., was published in 1868. Vol. vi., published in 1881, contains very incomplete Prolegomena. A photographic reproduction of the O. T. is announced. The photographic edit. of the N. T. has been

published. The Sinaitic MS. is an uncial of the fourth century, and is known as **S.** A portion of it was published under the title of *Cod. Frederico-Aug.* in 1846, and the larger portion of the remainder under title of *Bibl. Codex Sinaiticus Petropol.*, at St. Petersburg, in three vols. in 1862. Some further fragments of Gen. and Num. have appeared under title *App. cod. celeb. Sin., Vat., Alex.*, Leipzig, 1867. The other uncials are *Cod. Cott. Geneseos*, known as **D.**, at Brit. Mus., partly destroyed by fire, given in Tischendorf's *Monum. sacra ined. nov. coll.*, vol. ii., 1857, and further in F. W. Gotch's *Supplement*, Lond., 1881. **E.** is the *Cod. Bodl. Geneseos*, also in same vol. of Tischendorf. **F.** is the *Cod. Ambros.* (Gen. xxxi. 15-Josh. xii. 12 with gaps), edited by Ceriani in *Monum. sacr. et profana*, Medioli., 1864.

4. The text of the LXX. put forth by Origen (A.D. 236) in his Hexapla (see p. 61), was soon recognised as the *common* (*κοινὴ*) or accepted text. Later, Lucianus, Presbyter of Antioch, who died as a martyr in A.D. 311, issued a revised text, widely accepted in Syria and elsewhere. About the same time Hesychius, bishop and martyr (died 310 or 311 in Egypt), executed another revision, used extensively in that country. Paul de Lagarde published the first part of a restoration of the Lucianic recension in his *Librorum V. T. canon. pars prior Graece*, 1883 (541 pp., with xvi. pp. of preface), and is now preparing the 2nd vol. See also Field, *Origenis Hexapl.*, Prolegomena, cap. ix., and Driver, *Notes on Samuel*, Introd., pp. l.-lii.

5. There are two concordances to the LXX., that of Kircher, 1607, in 4to; or, better, that of Trommius, 2 vols. fol., 1718, neither satisfactory. The first fascic. of Dr. Hatch's Concordance to the LXX. is in press, and will soon be published. The Lexicon to the LXX. of J. Ch. Biel, 3 vols., 1779, edited in a considerably enlarged form in 5 vols. by J. F. Schleusner,

1821, is in many respects defective. C. A. Wahl edited a useful *Clavis Libb. V. T. Apocryph.*, in 4to, 1853.

6. The Book of Daniel according to the LXX. was first published by Simon de Magistris, in 1772; afterwards, from the Chigi codex, by H. A. Hahn, 1845, and given in Tischendorf's editions of the LXX. since 1856. More critically by J. Cozza in his *Sac. Bib. vetustiss. frag. græca et lat.*, Pars iii., Romæ, 1877.

The ancient versions which are based on the LXX. are the Itala (see chap. ix.), the Hexaplar Syriac (see chap. vii.), and the Ethiopic, though now considered not to have been made directly from the Greek, as also the Egyptian translations (Coptic and Sahidic). See Strack's *Einleitung*, 3rd edit., pp. 271, 272.

7. *The other Greek Translations.*—(1) Aquila, like the Jewish Christian of the same name mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, was a native of Pontus. His name in Greek is Ἀκύλας, in the Jerusalem Talmud it is Hebraised אַקְיָן, but in the Babylonian Talmud it is written אֲונְקָלִים (see chap. vi., p. 43). Aquila was a Greek proselyte to Judaism, and executed his translation from a polemical standpoint as a counterpoise to the LXX. translation, which was quoted by Christians in favour of their views. His translation seems to have been well received by the Jews. Only fragments of it unfortunately are extant. These prove it to have been slavishly literal, full of Hebraisms, and often only to be understood by reference to the Hebrew. It is a question of debate whether the extant translation of Ecclesiastes is not mainly the version of Aquila, and though the evidence is on the whole rather against that theory,

there can be little doubt that the LXX. translation of that book has incorporated not a few of the readings of Aquila. The version of Aquila is at least as old as the time of the Emperor Hadrian.

(2) Theodotion ($\Theta\epsilon\delta\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$, sometimes called $\Theta\epsilon\delta\sigma\tau\acute{o}\sigma$) was according to Irenæus a Jewish proselyte of Ephesus, and according to Eusebius, an Ebionite. As he is mentioned by Justin Martyr (cir. 160) he must have written prior to that date. His translation was in several respects a revision of the LXX. His translation of Daniel wholly supplanted the latter in ecclesiastical use. But of the other books only fragments of his version are extant.

(3) Symmachus ($\Sigma\acute{u}μu\alphaχos$) appears to have executed his version somewhat later than Theodotion. According to Eusebius he was an Ebionite; according to Epiphanius a Samaritan, who became a Jewish proselyte. He aimed at combining perspicuity of translation with fidelity to the original. Only fragments of his translation are also extant.

These three translations comprehended only the canonical books of the Old Testament, and not the apocryphal.

(4) The fragments of three other Greek versions have come down to us with the remains of the Hexapla of Origen. That work was so called from the six columns it contained, in which were (1) the Hebrew text in Hebrew, (2) the Hebrew written in Greek characters, with the versions of (3) Aquila, (4) Symmachus, (5) the LXX., and (6) Theodotion. Words wanting in the LXX. were supplied, generally from Theodotion's version, and marked with asterisks ;(*)

words in the LXX. in excess of the original text were marked with an obelos (÷), the shape of which mark is not always uniform. The copyists, however, often misunderstood these and other critical marks, and hence many errors have crept into the LXX. text, which not unfrequently contains conflate or duplicate renderings. The name *Tetrapla* was sometimes given to Origen's work, from editions which contained only the four columns of the Greek versions of Aquila, Symmachus, LXX., and Theodotion. The three other Greek translations are in some books of the Old Testament referred to by Origen, designated *Quinta*, *Sexta*, and *Septima*. The work of Origen was sometimes designated *Heptapla* and even *Octapla*, from occasionally containing seven or eight columns.

8. Bern. de Montfaucon edited in 1713 the fragments of Origen's work which remain, in 2 vols. folio. But the most complete and scholarly edition is that issued from the Oxford Press, *Origenis Hexaplorum quæ supersunt: sive Veterum interpretum Græcorum in totum Vetus Test. Fragmenta. Post Flaminium Nobilium, Drusium, et Montefalconium, adhib. etiam vers. Syro-Hexaplari, concinnavit, emend. et multis partibus auxit Fredericus Field, A.M.* 2 vols. 4to, 1875. See addenda on Aquila, Symm. and Theod. in Field's *Otium Norvicense*, Part i., 1864.

9. In the Hexapla the name יהוה is written in Greek ΙΙΙΙΙ. This fact, mentioned by Jerome, arose from ignorance in the scribes, and in the wish to reproduce the appearance of the sacred name. For ה in older forms of the Hebrew alphabet was written almost like נ, and the downstroke of the ' was sometimes prolonged so as to be like י. The Greek

ΠΙΠΙ is a close resemblance of יהוה (יְהוָה) as the word presented itself to their unpractised eyes.

10. The Greek translation, known as the *Græcus Venetus*, discovered in MS. in the library of St. Mark, Venice, is no authority for the ancient reading of the Hebrew text. It cannot be older than A.D. 1200, for the translator was acquainted with Kimchi's Book of Roots, and it was evidently executed from a pointed Hebrew text. It is, however, otherwise of much interest. The version, though sometimes barbarous Greek, is executed with great fidelity. Its author was a Jew acquainted with Greek literature, and with considerable insight into Hebrew. The best edition is that of Gebhardt : *Græcus Venetus, Pentateuchi, Proverbiorum, Ruth, Cantici, Ecclesiastæ, Thren., Danielis, Versio Græca. Ex unico Bibl. S. Marci Venetæ codice nunc primum uno vol. comprehensam atque apparatu critico et phil. instructam ed. O. Gebhardt. Præfatus est F. Delitzsch*, 1875. Delitzsch considers its author was an eminent Jewish scholar of the name of Elissaeus (עִזָּאֵן) who flourished in the fourteenth century.

CHAPTER IX.

THE ANCIENT LATIN VERSIONS.

1. THE version known as the Itala is the more ancient of the two Latin versions. The Itala is a very literal translation of the LXX., even to the extent of slavishly copying evident blunders, and hence it is of the greatest value as a witness to the LXX. text. It was executed in the second century, by unknown translators. Jerome speaks of only one such translation, while Augustine seems to refer to several. The name Itala is derived from a passage in Augustine (*De Doct. Christ.*, ii.), where according to Kreyssig and Eichhorn the name arose from an error of a scribe. If the word Itala be the true reading the version originated in Italy. The version has, however, been preserved only in extensive fragments, the only books of the Old Testament preserved entire being the Psalter, the Book of Esther, with the apocryphal books :—the third Book of Ezra, Tobit, Judith, Baruch, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and Maccabees.

The best edition of what remains is that of Sabatier : *Bibl. s. Latinæ Verss. antique s. Vetus Italica et cæteræ quæcunque in codd. mscr. et antiquorum libris reperiri potuerunt*, 1739-1749, 3 vols. folio, and with a new title by Didot, 1751. The third vol. contains the New Testament. Fragments from

palimpsests have been published by F. Münter, 1819 ; and by Ernst Ranke in 1871. Fragments of other antehieronymian versions, e.g. of 1 and 2 Kings, have been published by J. Haupt, Vindob., 1877, and by Ulysse Robert, *Pent. vers. Lat. antiquissima e cod. Lugd.*, Paris, 1881. See also L Ziegler, *Die lat. Bibelübersetzungen vor Hieron. u. die Itala des Augustinus*, München, 1879 (pp. 135, 4to). H. Rönsch, *Itala und Vulgata. Das Sprachidiot der urchristl. Itala und kathol. Vulgata*, etc. Marburg, 1869 (pp. 510). Also Rönsch's articles in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift f. wissensch. Theol.*, 1875, 1876 and 1881.

2. *The Vulgate.* As numerous corruptions crept into the old Latin version, Jerome in 382 set to work to revise that translation. His first edition of the Psalter was a simple revision of the Itala. The revision is known as the *Psalterium Romanum*, and was used up to the time of Pius V. in the Roman Church. Portions of it are yet to be found in the Missal and Breviary. But the work was done too hastily to be satisfactory. Jerome next revised many portions of the Old Testament version after Origen's Hexaplar text of the LXX. Of that revision only the Psalter and the Book of Job are extant. The revised translation of the Psalms is known as the *Psalterium Gallicanum*, because it came into common use in Gaul. Jerome then proceeded to translate the Psalms directly from Hebrew, and extended his translation to the other books of the Old Testament, inclusive of some of the Apocryphal books. The work was completed between A.D. 390-405. Jerome's revision of the Psalms known as the Gallican had, however, obtained so firm a footing that that version was incorporated into the Vulgate,

and not the translation from the Hebrew. Jerome's translation of the Psalter from the Hebrew has been separately edited by P. de Lagarde (Leipzig, 1874), and it is contained in the *Liber Psalmorum Heb. atque Latinus ab Hieronymo ex Hebræo conversus, consociata opera ediderunt C. de Tischendorf, S. Baer, F. Delitzsch.* Lipsiæ, 1874. It is also to be found in Bagster's *Biblia Ecclesiae Polyglotta.* 1843.

3. Jerome's Revised Version met with the bitterest opposition, and, although he strove to conciliate opponents, to the serious detriment of the work, by adhering as closely as possible to the older version, it was long ere it won popular favour. Jerome dictated his translation to an amanuensis, and this fact, combined with the common use of the older version, and the carelessness of the scribes, led to the serious depravation of the translation. In process of time it was generally received, and termed the common version or Vulgate. Alcuin, the preceptor of Charlemagne, effected something in the early part of the ninth century (801) towards a restoration of Jerome's translation, followed by Theodulf, Bishop of Orleans; and several attempts were made by other scholars in the same direction in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and by Correctoria biblica in the thirteenth. The result was, however, the still further corruption of the text.

4. The Vulgate was among the first, if not the very first book printed, but the earliest books were unfortunately printed without dates. The earliest editions, however, were printed from comparatively modern MSS., and hence are of little authority.

5. Cardinal Ximenes' edition of the Vulgate in the Complutensian Polyglott (1514-1517) was the first attempt at a critical text. R. Stephanus issued several improved editions, first in 1528, and later in folio in 1540. For the latter work he collated fourteen MSS., and several printed editions.

6. The decree of the Council of Trent (Sess. iv., April 8th, 1546) declared the Vulgate "authentic." This authorisation of the Vulgate necessitated the publication of a standard text, and an "editio authentica" appeared under Sixtus V. in 1590. The edition was declared in the Papal Bull to be "vera, legitima, authentica et indubitata in omnibus publicis privatisque disputationibus." But ere it was issued many readings had to be emended by printed slips pasted over the printed text, and other corrections were made with the pen. A new edition, after considerable controversy both without and within the Roman Church, was issued in 1592 in the Pontificate of Clement VIII. The text of the latter edition is said to differ from the former in about three thousand places. Other editions followed in 1593 and in 1598, each with considerable variations.

7. A critical edition of Jerome's translation has not yet appeared, although materials have been collected for such an edition by the labours of many scholars, especially for the New Testament portion. Vercellone (see p. 68) has collected important material for the correction of the Old Testament text. The English Biblical student will do well to consult the version known as *The Douay Version* as being an accredited, if not absolutely "authentic," English translation of

the Vulgate, in use in the Roman Catholic Church. For critical purposes that translation must be verified by reference to the Latin original.

The text of the present Vulgate is by no means uniform. The Old Testament is often a composition of the Itala and of Jerome. The greater portion of the work contains Jerome's translation from the Hebrew. The version of the Psalms as already noticed is that of the Gallican Psalter. Jerome added in his version critical marks after the example of Origen (see p. 61). But these have utterly disappeared, to the great detriment of the integrity of the text. The Apocryphal Books of Baruch, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and the Maccabees are taken from the Itala.

8. See *Bellum Papale s. concordia discors Sixti V. et Clementis VIII. circa Hieronymianam edit.* Auctore Thomas James, Lond., 1600. G. Riegler, *Kritische Gesch. d. Vulg.*, Salzbach, 1820. Leander van Ess (Rom. Cath.), *Pragmatisch-krit. Gesch. d. Vulg.*, Tübing., 1824. F. Kaulen (Rom. Cath.), *Gesch. d. Vulg.* (502 pp.), Mainz 1868; also his *Handb. zur Vulg.* (280 pp.), 1870. Bukentop, *Lux de luce libb. tres* [lib. iii. on the Sixtine ed.]. See also the Bible Dictionaries, especially the articles by O. F. Fritzsche in the *Prot. Real-Encyclop.*

| *Variae Lectiones Vulg. Lat. Bibl. edit.* quas Carolus Vercellone, Sodalis Barnabites digessit, 4to. This work, which was issued at Rome under Papal patronage, has been left unfinished by the death of the learned editor. Only three parts have appeared : Tom. i., *Pent.*, 1860. Tom. ii., Pars i., *Josue, Jud., Ruth et I. Reg.*, 1862. Tom. ii., Pars ii., *Libb. II., III., IV., Reg.*, 1864. Vercellone also edited a 4to edition of the Vulgate, Rom. 1861.

Bibl. sacra Latina V. T. Hieron. interp. ex antiquiss. auct. in stichos descript. Vulg. lect. . . . test. comitatur cod.

Amiatini latinorum omnium antiquiss. ed. instit. . . Theod. Heyse, ad fin. perdux. C. de Tischendorf, 1873. See also Baethgen in *Zeitschrift f. alt-test. Wiss.*, 1881 ; and Lagarde, *Probe einer neuen Ausgabe der lat. Uebersetzungen d. A. T.*, Götts., 1885.

PART II.

CHAPTER X.

THE PENTATEUCH IN GENERAL.

1. THE first five books of the Old Testament are commonly termed the Five Books of Moses, and designated the Pentateuch. The Greek name is ἡ πεντάτευχος scil. βίβλος, the word πεντάτευχος being used as an adjective. Τὸ τεῦχος properly denoted the box, or chest in which the rolls were kept, and was used also by Symmachus as a synonyme for the Hebrew חֲנֻכָּה, or *roll*. The Latin Pentateuchus is masculine, the word *liber* being supplied. The most common Hebrew title is the *Law* (the Torah, תֹּרַה, Neh. viii. 2ff), also called *The Book of the Law of Moses* (Neh. viii. 1), and other designations (Neh. viii. 3, ix. 3, xiii. 1). It is commonly termed in the Talmud and by the Rabbins חֵמֶשׁ הַתּُוֹרָה חֲמִשָּׁה חֲמִשָּׁה, *the five-fifths of the Law*. Other titles may here be passed over.

2. The Pentateuch occupies in the Old Testament a position akin to that which the Four Gospels occupy in the New. The account of our Lord's life presented in the Four Gospels is the basis on which the system

of faith and doctrine taught by the other writers of the New Testament is founded. Similarly the history and theology of the Pentateuch underlie the other books of the Old Testament. Even if it could be proved that the details of the Israelitish ritual set forth in the Pentateuch do not altogether harmonise with the references thereto in the other books of the Old Testament, it is indisputable that the facts of history set forth in the Pentateuch are everywhere accepted in the other books of the Jewish Scriptures, whether historical, prophetical, or poetical.

3. The five books of the Pentateuch do not, however, constitute a complete work. The Book of Joshua is required to finish the history, and to give symmetry to its several component parts. Nor does the Book of Joshua viewed separately present the appearance of a complete historical work. It is but the closing portion of the history begun in the Pentateuch. The partition of the land of Canaan among the twelve tribes of Israel is only the sequel of the narrative of the Exodus, to which the Book of Genesis is a grand introduction. Hence there is much in favour of the opinion now prevalent among critics, that the Hebrew Scripture commences with a Hexateuch rather than with a Pentateuch—*i.e.*, that they open with an historical work consisting originally of six books.

The acceptance, however, of this hypothesis, now adopted by the best critics, does not necessarily run counter to the substantial recognition of the Mosaic authorship of the earlier Five Books. The Pentateuch does not claim as a whole to have been written by Moses. It contains statements (*e.g.* Exod. xi. 3 and

Num. xii. 3) which cannot easily be reconciled with the traditional view, and passages which, according to the opinion of the most earnest defenders of the Mosaic authorship, must have been added long after the date of Moses.

4. Portions of the work, and those by no means inconsiderable, are unquestionably ascribed to Moses. These are: (1) "The Book of the Covenant," Exod. xx.-xxiii.; see Exod. xxiv. 4-7. (2) The Book of the Renewed Covenant, Exod. xxxiv. 10-26; see ver. 27. (3) The Divine decree concerning the destruction of Amalek, Exod. xvii. 14. (4) The list of the stations of "the journeys of the children of Israel," Num. xxxiii., which claims to be a compilation from the records of the Lawgiver; see Num. xxxiii. 2. (5) "The Law" referred to in Deut. xxxi. 9, 11, 24-26 is stated to be Mosaic, although the exact extent, however, of that "Law" is doubtful. Some critics suppose it to include the whole of the Book of Deuteronomy, because that book professes to contain the substance of Moses' last addresses to the children of Israel; others consider "the Law" spoken of to have been more restricted. (6) The Song of Moses, Deut. xxxii.; see Deut. xxxi. 19, 22. And (7) "The Blessing" of the twelve tribes, Deut. xxxiii.

5. The division of the Pentateuch itself into five separate books is not generally recognised in Hebrew MSS. In MSS. the five books are treated as one, and are divided into larger and smaller sections, numbered consecutively from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Deuteronomy. The division into books is not, however, on that account to be regarded as either

modern or arbitrary. The extant Hebrew MSS. are too modern to be any authority on such a point, while the work itself naturally falls into these five portions, more or less independent of each other. The Book of Joshua in Hebrew MSS. is always regarded as a separate work.

6. The arrangement of the Mosaic writings as a completed Pentateuch, and the treatment of the Book of Joshua as an independent history, can be traced back to the times of Ezra and Nehemiah. In the writings of that period the five books together are variously referred to as "the book of the Torah," or "Law" (Neh. viii. 3), "the Law" (Neh. viii. 2), "the Law of God" (Neb. viii. 8), and "the Law of Moses" (Ezra iii. 2; Mal. iii. 22, E. V. iv. 4). Similar designations occur in the New Testament, where the Jewish Scriptures are referred to as a whole under the title, "Moses and the Prophets," and where the books of the Pentateuch are quoted as "Moses," or "the Law." The expression "the Law" is, however, also employed in the New Testament to designate the books of the Old Testament in general. See John x. 34, xii. 34, xv. 25; 1 Cor. xiv. 21.

7. The Psalter was arranged in five books as far back as the time of Nehemiah (see ch. xiv. § 2), and that division had special reference to the five books of the Pentateuch. The Midrash on Ps. i. 1 observes: "Moses gave the Israelites the five books of the Law, and, corresponding to these, David gave to them the Book of the Psalms, in which are five books." Delitzsch remarks: "This division into five parts makes the

Psalter a copy and echo of the Torah, which it resembles also in this, that as in the Torah, Elohistic and Jehovistic sections alternate, so in the Psalter, there is a group of Elohistic Psalms (Pss. xlii.-lxxxiv.) enclosed on both sides by groups of Jehovistic Psalms (Pss. i.-xli. and lxxxv. to cl.).” The Psalter was so arranged that the opening Psalms of each of its five books should correspond with the several books of the Pentateuch. The first book of the Psalter commences with Ps. i., which in its phraseology brings back to memory the garden of Eden and the streams by which it was irrigated. The second book commences with Ps. xlii., which treats of the affliction in Egypt, and the deliverance from thence of the people of Israel, corresponding thus with the Book of Exodus. The third book begins with Ps. lxxiii., which recounts the goodness of God in giving Israel the Law (detailed in Leviticus), which Law was an abiding mercy, however severely Israel might be oppressed by their Gentile conquerors. The fourth book opens with Ps. xc., the “prayer of Moses, the man of God;” and in the numbering of the days of human existence spoken of in ver. 12 the pious editors of the Psalter, no doubt, saw an apt reference to the numbering of the people narrated in the fourth Book of Moses. The fifth and last book of the Psalter begins with Ps. cvii., in which “the goodness” of the Lord in days of trouble and distress is insisted on as vouchsafed in answer to prayer. The Psalm is a fitting parallel to Moses’ recapitulation of the instances of God’s lovingkindness to Israel set forth in Deuteronomy.

8. Although the division of the Mosaic books into five, and their separation from the Book of Joshua, with which they seem once to have been united, is of remote antiquity, the first writer known to use the name "Pentateuch" (*Pentateuchus*, scil. *liber*) is the Latin Father, Tertullian (*Contra Marc.*, i. 10). The name occurs in Tertullian's writings in such a way as to show, however, that the expression was not one specially invented by himself. The designation was also employed by Origen (*in Joann.*, cap. 26), ἡ πεντάτευχος (*βίβλος*).

9. The Mosaic authorship of the entire Pentateuch was affirmed by the ancient Jewish authorities. They maintained that even the concluding verses of Deuteronomy, which record the death and burial of the great Lawgiver, were written by him "with tears" in anticipation of his approaching end. So Josephus, Philo, and the Talmud in *Baba Bathra*, 15a, *Menachoth*, 30a. The extravagance of such an idea was seen somewhat later, and the verses at the end of Deuteronomy were then ascribed to Joshua. The early Christian writers at first accepted without examination the conclusions of the Jewish writers. Some, however, as Jerome and Theodoret, expressed doubts on the point whether the Pentateuch was the work of Moses or Ezra.

Modern critics who call in question the Mosaic authorship often reject "the supernatural." It is, therefore, *prima facie* not unreasonable to suppose that they have been led to deny the Mosaic authorship by the wish to bring down the ancient Hebrew literature to the level of the other ancient literatures.

But the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch has been called in question by many investigators who have no desire whatever to detract from the authority, or to deny the Divine inspiration, of the books in question. Theological prepossessions ought not, therefore, to be permitted to stand in the way of historical investigation. The Book of the Psalter retains its full value and importance, whatever conclusions be arrived at as to the credibility of the titles prefixed to the different Psalms, and the same can be maintained substantially in reference to the Books of the Pentateuch.

Some theologians have sought to settle the question by adducing the statements (see p. 73), of our Lord and His Apostles. Our Lord refers to the Pentateuch as the writings of Moses (John v. 45-47, etc.), and speaks of the Law as given by Moses (John vii. 19), which statement is repeated by St. John (John i. 17). Commandments contained in the Pentateuch are cited as directions of Moses (Matt. viii. 4; Mark vii. 10; Luke xx. 37, etc.). All, however, that can be fairly deduced from such statements is, the Pentateuch contains portions written by Moses. It does not follow that the five books as a whole were written by that lawgiver. Nor is it derogatory to our Lord's Divinity to maintain that He argued from the Jewish standpoint, without necessarily endorsing the truth of the popular opinion. Comp. Luke xi. 19.

10. The modern notion of the fame of authorship was not largely prevalent among the Hebrews. The ancient Israelites did not exhibit that pride in literary composition common among Gentile nations.

Stress was laid upon what was written, rather than upon the authorship of the writing itself. It was not till after the Jews had come into connection with the Greeks and Romans that the individual pride of literary authorship was aroused in the Hebrew breast. The reaction against heathen literature awakened by the events of the Maccabee period led to the depreciation of anything in the shape of literary production. For centuries after that period "the holy books" were as a rule the only compositions committed to writing. The sententious sayings of the "wise men" of Israel, their parables, Biblical expositions, vernacular paraphrases of the sacred books (often embellished with stories and legends), and their discussions, even on the most intricate questions of law and ritual, were all exclusively committed to the faithful and well-trained memories of disciples.*

11. The phenomena of the Hebrew Scriptures lead to the conclusion that those writings were re-edited from time to time, and that notes and additions of a later period were not unfrequently introduced into the more ancient texts. The care and strictness in the copying of the sacred MSS. enjoined by the Jews in post-Christian times was comparatively unknown at an earlier era. In the Jewish Targums, text and comments are hopelessly blended, and the same phenomenon is apparent in many places of the LXX. version. This practice prevailed not from any desire to falsify the sacred writings, but with the object of

* See on this point, J. S. Bloch, *Studien zur Gesch. d. Sammlung der alt-heb. Literatur*, and the Excursus at the end of my *Koheleth*, pp. 456, 484.

their explanation. The Hebrew language itself must have been repeatedly modernised, although to what extent we have no means of ascertaining. The sacred books were not, indeed, "tampered with," in the modern sense of the term. The laws set forth in the Pentateuch, although essentially Mosaic, underwent revision at a later period, to be adapted to the altered circumstances of the nation. It is not surprising that some laws of the Pentateuch should be extant only in a revised form; but it is remarkable that so many have been handed down to us, redolent of the air of the desert and of the circumstances of camp life. The necessary modification of laws in the process of time has been too often left out of consideration. The Pentateuch itself contains instances of laws modified even in the time of Moses, *e.g.* the enactments as to the property of women (*Num. xxxvi.*), etc. Many similar modifications must have taken place in the course of Israel's troubled history (see p. 82). The ritual itself demanded occasional modifications, which were justifiable so long as the spirit and object of the legislation were retained. Some of these may, perhaps, be traced to a limited extent, but no details can be laid down with any certainty. Notwithstanding the frequent apostasies of Israel, no modification of ritual or of song was ever made in the direction of idolatry. The Pentateuch was the store-house of the laws and religion of Israel. Its books were placed under the guardianship, not only of the priests and prophets (often at discord with one another), but of the whole nation. Had the Pentateuch been preserved in its archaic form, it would have been a peculum of the

priests, but could not have been safeguarded by the people. But being in the possession of the people, no modifications of importance could have been made except under competent authority, although occasionally necessary in order to make the Law a practical guide for religious duty and national life. The Pentateuch, as its contents show, was not intended to be an archaeological curiosity, to be muttered, chanted, or even expounded, by a learned priesthood. It was the common possession of the nation at large.

Critical investigation, indeed, has revealed the fact that all the historical books of the Hebrew canon are artificially linked together in order to form one continuous history of "the holy nation." They were probably thus united together under the superintendance of Ezra, who was in many respects a second Moses. Links were designedly added to each book to unite them into one grand whole. Those "links" are sometimes found in references in the middle of the books. But the most remarkable are the connecting links ("and") with which each of the five great subdivisions commence. For as the Law, or Pentateuch, was subdivided into its five books, so also the historical books, inclusive of the Law itself, were similarly arranged in five parts, to wit: (1) the Law, or Pentateuch; (2) Joshua; (3) Judges; (4) The Books of Samuel; (5) The Books of Kings. The other books classified in the English Bible (after the order of the Latin Vulgate) among the historical books, namely the Books of Ruth and Chronicles, are not found in that order in the Hebrew Bible, but are placed among the Hagiographa. See pp. 38, 39.

12. The arguments in favour of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch cannot be here set forth even in outline. Nor can any impartial summary be given of the arguments on the opposite side. The references to its histories and laws found in the other Old Testament books, are in favour of a Mosaic authorship. Some of its laws were applicable only to a nomadic people like Israel in the desert, others could only be obeyed when the people were in possession of the land of Canaan. Some became obsolete when the territories of the individual tribes were no longer preserved; others when the political circumstances of the nation rendered it impossible to observe much of the legislation designed for the maintenance of individual or of ecclesiastical property. The ritual of the Day of Atonement became in many details obsolete after the Exile; when the injunctions concerning the construction and removal of the Tabernacle were no longer of importance. The knowledge of Egyptian customs which characterises Genesis and Exodus cannot be satisfactorily accounted for on the theory of the composition of the Pentateuch after the Exile. And even those portions of Genesis (such as the history of the flood) which seem to show an acquaintance with the Assyrian and Babylonian literature, contain important indications of belonging themselves to a far earlier period. See p. 105.

13. The unity of design traceable throughout the Pentateuch or Hexateuch is remarkable. The work is no patchwork put together without a definite object. Though its composite character may be admitted, the documents made use of are united and

interwoven so as to form a work remarkable for unity of purpose. The differences in details, brought to light by critical analysis (which has too often exhibited a hypercritical tendency), are not destructive of the general harmony of the Pentateuch, any more than the variations in detail which exist in the Gospels. Such differences when duly weighed are confirmatory of the main facts of the history.

The object of the Hexateuch was to relate the history of Israel up to the occupation of Canaan. The Song of Moses (Deut. xxxii. 7-12), gives a summary of the contents of the history. The accounts of the creation, and of the peopling of the world, are introductory to the narrative of the call of Abraham, and the history of Israel's progenitors. Whatever subsidiary information be imparted, the main object in view was never forgotten. The work is not a secular history; it is not a collection of national legends; it is a religious history; a history *sui generis*. The God of Israel who guided the patriarchs in their wanderings is ever represented not as a mere national divinity, but as the God of the whole earth. The selection or election of Israel is related not as a matter of national pride, but as an event of world-wide importance. Abraham was called out of the midst of idolaters, that in him "all the families of the earth" might "be blessed" (Gen. xii. 3). The Pentateuch, as well as the New Testament, teaches the doctrine that Israel was chosen with the ultimate object distinctly in view, that through Israel the world might be blessed. "Salvation is from the Jews" (John iv. 22).

14. In examining the Mosaic records, and tabulating the differences in detail which are to be found in the laws themselves, the absolute necessity of the gradual expansion of law must not be lost sight of. The same phenomenon exists in the laws of the New Testament. The Sermon on the Mount sets forth many of the most remarkable features of our Lord's teaching. But strange conclusions might be drawn from it, if its doctrines were considered without reference to later developments. The Sermon on the Mount sets forth the duties of individuals. But the duties of individuals become necessarily modified when considered in relation to the family, society, or nation. The readiness to forgive injuries, which is so commendable in an individual, would be highly detrimental in the case of a judge. Laws which are good under some circumstances may, when the conditions are altered, become even hurtful. Variations in a commandment do not necessarily imply difference of authorship, nor are differences of detail in narratives always to be regarded as contradictions. If the first directions which our Lord gave to the Apostles and to the Seventy (Luke ix. 3, x. 4) had been preserved, and the altered commands given at a later period (Luke xxii. 35, 36) had been left unrecorded, a very different opinion would be formed of the early Christian ministry. On the other hand, if the latter directions had been recorded in the Gospel of St. John, and omitted in that of St. Luke, the fact would have long ago been paraded as a conclusive argument against the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel. The differences existing in the Pentateuch as to the details

of ritual, etc., ought, therefore, to be well-weighed before being brought forward as fatal to unity of authorship or of design.

15. The composite character of the Pentateuch is, indeed, one of the accepted results of modern criticism. The old traditional view can be no longer regarded as correct. The dogmatism of the old divines on the Mosaic authorship of the entire Pentateuch is no longer defensible. But the ship of the Pentateuch is not thereby left to be driven hither and thither on the stormy ocean of the so-called "higher criticism." Satisfactory evidence (part of which has been alluded to already) can be adduced to prove that the main outlines of the work are Mosaic. A bold and fearless attitude, however, on all such questions on the part of the Biblical student is more likely to convince gain-sayers, and to inspire confidence, than a timid appeal to authority by the endeavour to put an undue strain on New Testament statements. The history of Biblical criticism in past ages ought to be a sufficient warning to theologians not to have recourse to a line of argumentation which again and again has proved disastrous to the cause of truth, and which, in place of driving away the clouds of scepticism, has tended only to foster unbelief among students. The safest course for the apologists of the Bible to adopt is boldly to argue that the foundations of faith are in reality unaffected by any conclusions which may be arrived at on purely literary questions. Such an attitude has been already judiciously assumed, even with regard to the Gospels, by Row, in his work on the *Jesus of the Evangelists*, and in his *Bampton Lectures*. And

a similar attitude ought to be assumed in relation to Old Testament investigations in general, and to inquiries into the composition of the Pentateuch in particular. No theories of inspiration can be permitted to stifle investigation. The existence of the "supernatural" in Scripture and the Divine inspiration of the prophets and "holy men of old" is by no means shaken by the fact of historical discrepancies, or even by occasional contradictions in books which have come down to us from such distant ages. Those who, in the face of modern critical investigation, affirm the necessity of a belief in the historical infallibility of every fact recorded in the Sacred Writings, verily "know not neither what they say nor whereof they affirm."

CHAPTER XI.

SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF PENTATEUCH CRITICISM.

1. **T**HE opposition to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch on the part of some of the early heretics was based on dogmatic and not on critical reasons. There is no evidence to show how early critical doubts on the subject first arose among the Jews. The fact that Ibn Ezra (ob. circa 1167) controverted the views of a critic of the eleventh century after Christ, who assigned portions of Genesis to the time of Jehoshaphat, is a proof that the old Jewish scholars were not unanimous on the question. Among the scholars of the Reformation, Carlstadt (1520), on critical grounds, called in question the Mosaic authorship of the whole of the Pentateuch, although he regarded the Law as Mosaic. He thus anticipated the conclusions arrived at by conservative scholars in the present day. Masius (1574) maintained that the Pentateuch received its present shape from Ezra. The critics of the following centuries explained the anachronisms of the books, and the other discrepancies which were successively brought to light, by supposing that the books of the Pentateuch contained more or less extensive interpolations.

2. The work of Astruc (1753), a distinguished Professor of Medicine at Paris, gave a new direction to critical investigation. Like his great predecessor Vitringa, Astruc maintained that Moses made use of earlier documents in the composition of the Pentateuch, and that large portions of those documents were incorporated wholesale into his work. The documents so incorporated were, he maintained, easily distinguishable from each other by their use of different names for the Divine Being, one document using exclusively the name *Elohim* (God), while another preferred to employ the name *Jehovah* (or Jahveh). Astruc maintained, however, that besides the main Elohistic and Jehovistic documents, Moses made use of nine other minor writings, which could be distinguished by careful study and comparison of passages. His theory was expanded by subsequent scholars, the majority of whom denied even a Mosaic editorship, some assigning the Pentateuch to the period which intervened between Joshua and Samuel, and others to a later date.

3. The writings of Astruc, and of the scholars who followed, gave rise to various theories on the subject of the composition of the Pentateuch. (*a*) The *fragment-hypothesis* had been propounded earlier by Peyrer (1655) and Spinoza (1670), but their suggestions had been generally disregarded. The theory was now adopted with considerable variety of detail by Alex. Geddes (1792-1800), a learned and free-thinking Roman Catholic; by J. S. Vater (1802-1805); A. Th. Hartmann (1831), etc. According to it, the Pentateuch was composed by the piecing

together of a number of fragments, often united without a very definite plan. This hypothesis, though it held its ground for a time, was finally abandoned as untenable. (b) It was followed by the *enlargement* or *completion-hypothesis*, according to which the Elohistic portion of the work was viewed as the basis, and the whole supposed to have been revised by a later editor, the Jehovahist, who added to it not only a considerable number of fresh sections, but also notes throughout. Deuteronomy was, according to this theory, supposed to be the latest portion of the work. This hypothesis, which would now be considered conservative, was upheld by a number of eminent scholars, among whom Tuch (1838), Bleek (ob. 1859), and Knobel (ob. 1863) may perhaps be mentioned as the most remarkable. (c) The *document-hypothesis*, which is still the prevailing theory, requires more particular notice, as well as (d) the *Graf-Wellhausen-hypothesis*, which is a modification of the latter with, however, important differences. See pp. 95 ff.

4. The critical theories of de Wette (1817-1844) were from the first unfavourable to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. According to him, the only Mosaic fragment in existence was the Decalogue. Although his opinions on the point were strongly opposed by eminent scholars, his arguments in proof that Deuteronomy and the other four books were the work of different authors gradually won general acceptance, and were carried further by Bleek, who maintained that the Book of Joshua was an integral part of the completed work, and consequently

that the Jewish Scriptures originally commenced with a Hexateuch. See p. 71.

5. The *Document-hypothesis*. The researches of Ewald and others led to the general acceptance among critics of the view that the Elohistic and Jehovahistic documents could be distinctly traced throughout the whole of the Pentateuch; although the special peculiarity in the use of the Divine names, which gave rise to the nomenclature in question, did not extend beyond Exod. vi. The existence of the documents was afterwards traced throughout the Book of Joshua, and, according to some, traces of them are to be found even in the Book of Judges. The Elohistic portions of the Pentateuch were regarded by Ewald, Hupfeld, and others, to be the work of several authors, the Elohistic portions being generally considered more ancient than the Jehovahistic.

The four documents out of which the Hexateuch was supposed to have been originally drawn up, are, the First Elohist, the Second Elohist, the Jehovahist, and the Deuteronomist. (1) The *First Elohist*, whose narrative was assumed as the basis of the work. This document embraces portions of Genesis, most of Exodus and Leviticus. Fragments of it are found in Numbers, in a few passages of Deuteronomy, and throughout a considerable portion of the Book of Joshua. The narrative of the First Elohist was termed by Ewald *the Book of Origins*, and by Nöldeke the *foundation-document*. It is variously designated by other scholars. Schrader terms it the *Annalist*, Dillmann simply denotes it by A. Wellhausen has styled it *the Book of the Four Covenants*, namely,

those recorded in Gen. i. 28-30, ix. 1-17, xvii., Exod. vi. 2 ff.). Hence he distinguishes it by the letter Q, an abbreviation of the Latin *quatuor*. Inasmuch as the object of the writer was to extend the knowledge of the Law among the people, and the book was drawn up by one closely connected with the priestly order, Wellhausen has given it (as finally enlarged by various additions made throughout its whole extent) the name of the Priests' Code, or the Priestly Code. It is, therefore, now very generally referred to under the abbreviation PC, or P. Within the work thus designated, the body of laws contained in Lev. xvii.-xxvi. has been considered so peculiar, as to have necessarily constituted a separate work by itself. This smaller portion is termed by Klostermann and Delitzsch the *Law of Holiness*, because it emphasizes in a special manner the holiness which belongs to Jehovah, and ought to characterize His people. Hence this portion of the Priests' Code is often referred to as HG. (the initials of the German phrase *Heiligeits-Gesetz*). The English initials LH. (*Law of Holiness*) are, however, substituted for the German in the recent English translation of Delitzsch's *New Commentary on Genesis*. Dillmann, however, terms this particular *corpus legum* the *Sinaitic Law*, and marks it by S. Kuenen again refers to it as P¹, to distinguish it from P², by which latter sign he designates the Priests' Code. This smaller body of law is supposed to have had a historical introduction prefixed to it, parts of which may possibly have been incorporated into the Priests' Code.

(2) The *Second*, or *Younger Elohist*, is generally so

called, as contrasted with the former writer. Wellhausen and his followers, however, maintain that the writer of the Priests' Code was in reality the earlier. This Second Elohist is sometimes styled the *Theocratic Narrator*, from the special bent of his narrative. The document is marked B by Dillmann, as second in age and antiquity. Kuenen, Delitzsch, and others denote it by E (*Elohist*), as they conceive the writer to be in reality the earlier *Elohist*.

(3) The *Jehovist*, or, more properly, the *Jahvist*. The vocalization of the four-lettered name JHVH as *Jehovah*, is, of course, critically indefensible, and is merely a concession to popular usage (see p. 36). The Jehovistic document is regarded by Dillmann as third in order of antiquity, and, therefore, marked C. It is, however, more generally indicated by J, the initial of *Jehovist*. The writer is styled by Schrader "the prophetical narrator." The connection between the *Jehovist* and the Second Elohist is generally considered one of the most perplexing questions belonging to the higher criticism of the Pentateuch, and the combination of the two latter documents is commonly designated by JE.

(4) The fourth document is generally known as the *Deuteronomist*, and designated by D alike by Dillmann and the other scholars, although, of course, for different reasons. The fourth writer is generally considered to have had before him the writings of the three earlier compilers combined into a connected history. Hence his additions inserted in the other portions of the work were denoted by the letter R

(*Redactor* or *Editor*). There are other abbreviations occasionally employed, which, though they may annoy, need not confuse the student, such as P¹ P² for the earlier and later editions of PC, R¹ R² for first and second editor, J¹ J² for first and second Jehovahist, D¹ D² for first and second Deuteronomist, etc. LL is in Colenso's works used for Later Legislation.

The four principal writers already noticed are supposed also to have made use of earlier documents, such as: the Decalogue (Exod. xx. 2-17), the Book of the Covenant (Exod. xx. 22-xxiii. 19), the Song of Moses and Miriam (Exod. xv.), the Book of the Wars of Jehovah (Num. xxi. 14, 15), as well as a number of minor pieces—Israelitish—as the Song of the Well (Num. xxi. 17, 18); or Amorite or Moabitish, like the fragment of a song found in Num. xx. 27-30, the story and prophecies of Balaam (Num. xxii.-xxiv.). Further documents are: Moses' Song concerning Israel (Deut. xxxii.), the Blessing of the Tribes (Deut. xxxiii.), the Book of Jashar (Josh. x. 12, 13). The last-named book contained also David's Lament over Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam. i. 8 ff.), and cannot, therefore, have been composed earlier than David's time; which fact goes far to prove that the Book of Joshua, as we have it, is itself later than that date.

6. *The Date of the Documents.* (a) Nöldeke assigns the first three documents to the tenth or ninth centuries before Christ. According to his view, the writers lived at dates not far removed from each other. The Priests' Code cannot have been the oldest document; but it cannot have been much younger than the other documents, and may perhaps

be assigned to about 800 b.c. The Deuteronomist wrote shortly prior to Josiah's reformation.

(b) Schrader assigns the Priests' Code to the days of David. According to that scholar's view, the Second Elohist wrote shortly after the great schism between the kingdoms of Israel and Judah (b.c. 975-950); while the Jehovist, who combined into one the narratives of the two preceding writers, making himself numerous additions, produced his work between b.c. 825-800. The Deuteronomist is also considered by him to have lived in the time of Josiah, and to have been one of the prophets. The latter linked on his own work to that of the former writers. To the Deuteronomist belong portions of Joshua. The separation of the Book of Joshua from the Pentateuch took place after the Babylonian captivity, and very probably received official sanction. Schrader considers that the Books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings contain extracts from the works of the Second Elohist and the Jehovist.

It may be well to note that the Hexateuch, when viewed in combination with the three Books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings, is sometimes styled by the name *Octateuch*, because the Book of Judges in its original shape is supposed to have included Judges and 1 Sam. i.-vii., the remaining portion of 1 Sam., with 2 Sam. and 1 and 2 Kings, being regarded as forming really one work—the Book of the Kings.

(c) Dillmann coincides with Nöldeke in his estimation of the age of the Priests' Code. He considers, however, that the work contains portions which go back to a remote antiquity, such as that portion

specially termed by him the *Sinaitic legislation* (p. 89). In the able dissertation appended to his *Commentary on Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Joshua* (1886), he strongly combats the theories of Wellhausen and Kuenen, which assign that document to post-exilic times. The Second Elohist, according to Dillmann, drew up his work in the first half of the ninth century, prior to the reign of Jeroboam II. The Jehovahist is assigned to the middle of the eighth century, and the Deuteronomist to the seventh.

(d) Delitzsch has in his latest writings considerably modified the views defended in his earlier works. Formerly he considered Deuteronomy as in the main Mosaic, and written by some of those personally acquainted with the great Lawgiver. In his latest writings he has substantially given in his adhesion to those who maintain that the Hexateuch is a work formed by the combination of the four great documents noted above. The Book of Joshua, according to him, stands in the same relation to Deuteronomy as that in which the Book of Nehemiah stands to Ezra. Delitzsch justly lays great emphasis on the fact that the terms *Law* and *Pentateuch* are not identical. The Pentateuch contains the Law, but cannot in all its parts be identified with it, although this has been assumed as a fact by the vast majority of the older commentators. Delitzsch coincides to a very considerable extent with the conclusions already mentioned. He maintains, indeed, that there are large Mosaic elements contained in the Pentateuch, but that these are mixed up with others of a much later date. The Priestly Code has, indeed, its roots

in the Mosaic period, but belongs as a whole to the close of the Jewish state. It is, however, as a whole, pre-exilian, and prior to the time of Ezekiel. Ezekiel's work was influenced by it, not the reverse. Delitzsch considers that the history of the creation and onwards to the death of Joseph was written in very ancient days. The Jehovist and the Deuteronomist were post-Solomonic, but certainly composed before the days of Isaiah. There may be, however, passages in the Pentateuch added even in post-exilian days.

7. *The Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis.* The theory which is at present most in favour with the progressive school of criticism is that known by the name of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis. The theory was propounded in 1835 by both Vatke (*Bibl. Theolog.*) and George (*Die älteren jüd. Feste*), but was then sharply criticised, and fell into disrepute. Ed. Reuss, though he did not publish his views so early, had in his lectures, since 1833, called attention to the fact that the history of Israel set forth in Judges, Samuel, and Kings contains much which conflicts with the theory that the Laws of the Pentateuch were in force among that people. He further maintained that the Mosaic code was utterly unknown to the prophets of the eighth and seventh centuries. According to him, Jeremiah was the earliest prophet who knew of a written law (ch. ii. 8, xviii. 18, etc.), and his quotations are made exclusively from Deuteronomy. Deuteronomy (ch. iv. 45-xxviii.) was the book which "the priests pretended to have found in the temple in the time of king Josiah," and that code of law is the most ancient part of

the codified legislation contained in the Pentateuch. Ezekiel lived prior to the redaction of the Ritual code, and of the laws which were definitely arranged by the hierarchy. Reuss' *Geschichte* appeared first in 1864, afterwards in 1881 and 1890, and his French work on the Pentateuch and Joshua in 1879. But previous to their publication, K. H. Graf, a former pupil of Reuss, published essays in which similar views were propounded, in 1855, 1857, 1866, in Merx' *Archiv* (1867-1869), and in the first part of a work on *Die geschichtl. Bücher*, 1866. He maintained that almost the whole of the legal portion of the Pentateuch was post-exilian, and of a later age than the historical narratives. Graf died in 1866. In 1874 Aug. Kayser published his work, *Das vorexil. Buch der Urgeschichte Israels*, and in 1881 articles on the state of the Pentateuch controversy. In these publications he defended the views of Graf, and maintained that the earliest Pentateuch document was the Jehovahist, next the Deuteronomist, and last of all the Elohist.

Professor Kuenen, of Leyden, already well known as a Biblical critic, came forward in defence of Graf's hypothesis in his *Godsdienst van Israel*, 1869, 1870, translated into English by A. H. May, 3 vols., 1881-2, in his Commentary on the Books of Moses, 1872, and his *Hist.-krit. Einleitung*, translated into German, 1885-1890. See p. 8, and *Appendix*.

But the most able exponent of the theory is unquestionably J. Wellhausen, whose work on the Text of Samuel, published in 1871, excited great attention. His articles on the Composition of the Pentateuch appeared in 1876, 1877, and 1878, in

which year he published the fourth edition of Bleek's *Introduction to the Old Testament*, with emendations of his own. Among other works may be mentioned his *Prolegomena zur Gesch. Israels*, being the second edition of his *History of Israel*, vol. i., originally published in 1878. His article on "Israel" in the new edition of the *Encyclop. Britannica*, vol. xiii., is specially interesting for English students. Wellhausen's views are extremely radical. He does not acknowledge even the Decalogue to be Mosaic. The Book of the Covenant (Exod. xx. 22-xxiii. 19), he considers, was given to a settled agricultural people. The Jahvist is "of the golden age of Hebrew literature . . . the time of kings and prophets" prior to the Assyrian captivity. The work of that writer "breaks off suddenly at the blessing of Balaam." Only a few fragments of the Jahvist occur later, as in Num. xxv. 1-5 and Deut. xxxiv. The Deuteronomist was composed shortly before the eighteenth year of Josiah, and then contained only ch. xii.-xxvi. It underwent several revisions and enlargements after the Exile. The Second Elohist was much later than the Jahvist, and similarly edited. By the second revisers of the Deuteronomist the work of the Jahvist and Elohist were united together, and this combination marked JE is what Wellhausen terms the Jehovahist, as contrasted with the earlier Jahvist. He further regards the body of laws in Lev. xvii.-xxvi. (see ch. v. 1) as post-exilian, originating between Ezekiel and the Priests' Code, not composed by that prophet, but nearly related to him. The portion of the Hexateuch which remains after the

exclusion of those parts belonging to the Jahvist, Elohist, and Deuteronomist is regarded as later than the days of Ezekiel, and "a conglomerate as well as the work of an entire school." The Priests' Code embraced, with some few exceptions, Exod. xxv.-xxxii., xxxv.-xl., the Book of Leviticus, Num. i.-x., xv.-xix., xxv.-xxxvi. The portions which originally belonged to "the Book of the Four Covenants," termed by other scholars the First Elohist, are, according to Wellhausen, Exod. xxv.-xxix.; Lev. ix., x. 1-5, 12-15, xvi.; Num. i. 1-16, i. 48 to iii. 9, 15 to ch. x. 28, and part of xvi., xvii., xviii., xxv. 6-19, xxvi., xxvii., xxxii. in part, xxxiii. 50 to xxxvi. The Pentateuch formed by the combination of all these elements was finally published by Ezra in the year 444; for, according to Wellhausen, there is no doubt but that the Law of Ezra was the entire Pentateuch.

In this sketch of Wellhausen's views we have partly drawn on the able article entitled "Pentateuch," written by Strack, in *Herzog-Plitt's Encyclopädie*. It is impossible to notice the details of all the recent modifications of the theory. Notwithstanding the ability with which the hypothesis has been put forward, the arguments by which it has been defended (to which justice cannot be done in any bald summary of results), or the popularity it has attained among critics, it may safely be predicted that the hypothesis will not long be regarded by any number of scholars as a satisfactory solution of the question of the composition of the Pentateuch.

8. While new evidence is constantly accumulating of the vast extent of the literature and historical

knowledge possessed by the ancient Egyptians, Babylonians, and Assyrians, the Graf-Wellhausen theory would reduce a large portion of Israelitish history up to a short time prior to the Exile to a mass of legends and uncertain traditions. If this were the case, the Israelites must have been far inferior in civilization to the other great nations with whom they came in contact, although so vastly superior to those nations from a theological point of view. This fact is a marvel of which the critics of this school do not seem to have any conception, while in other matters they exhibit wonderful subtlety. The non-observance of any law of the Pentateuch is, on their theory, constantly assumed to be a proof of its non-existence, although many similar facts can be pointed out, like that recorded in *Jer. xxxiv. 8 ff.* Their idea, that the description of the tabernacle is only a fancy sketch copied from the temple, loses sight of the fact of the important differences between the two erections. The description of the tabernacle itself is so minute in its details as to admit of its being actually constructed from the sketch presented in the Book of Exodus, which in itself is a proof of its historical existence (see *App.*). It is hard to imagine a post-exilian writer taking a delight in working out such details, if purely imaginary; or even in filling up minute details, the broad outlines of which were only derived from tradition handed down for centuries. It is especially important, from an apologetic point of view, to observe that a considerable number of those details are devoid of any special symbolical significance. The post-Reformation interpreters erred widely by attempt-

ing an arbitrary interpretation of all those details in the interest of their peculiar theological opinions. But those theologians committed a mistake in attempting to read their theology into the Old Testament, and they went much further than is justified by the Epistle to the Hebrews.

The tabernacle of Moses, like the temple of Solomon, had unquestionably an historical basis, while the description of the temple of Ezekiel can be shown to belong entirely to the region of the ideal. The popular school of "unlearned and unstable" expositors insists blindly upon "literal fulfilments" of prophecy, and bid us conveniently to look out to the future for anything which has not yet been literally fulfilled. That school has wrought no little mischief in the exposition of Scripture, and has unwittingly played, as George Stanley Faber long ago foresaw it would, into the hands of the Rationalists.

It is very convenient, on the other hand, for scholars who defend the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis to seek to get rid of all, or many, of the references found in the Prophets and other Scriptures to the incidents of early days, as later interpolations. There has been, indeed, on the part of these critics too great a disposition to "cook" the documents examined, and to assume, on mere hypothesis, that words, sentences and paragraphs opposed to certain theories are merely the insertions of later editors. Many facts connected with the Levites and their position, which are perfectly explicable on the assumption of the Pentateuch being substantially Mosaic, become bewildering on

any other theory. Although the composite character of the Pentateuch may be regarded as fairly proven, the theory of Wellhausen and his followers is unlikely to obtain general acceptance. Several of the points accepted by the more conservative *Document-hypothesis* are likely ultimately to be abandoned, as accepted on insufficient evidence. The conclusions generally drawn from the history of 2 Kings xxii. (and 2 Chron. xxxiv.) as to the composition of Deuteronomy during Josiah's reign, or shortly prior to it, cannot be justified by fair argumentation. The persecution which took place in the days of Manasseh is more than sufficient to account for the general ignorance of the Book of Deuteronomy in the early days of Josiah. Critics have exhibited too great an avidity to discover discrepancies where none exist, while the harmonists have erred by attempting to harmonize everything. They have too often sought to assume for their hypotheses the position of well-ascertained facts. The cautious critic will admit discrepancies where they really exist, but no further. Such discrepancies may, or may not, be contradictions. The infallibility of the Hebrew Scriptures is a theory which only embarrasses an honest investigator, and tends to obscure important evidence in favour of the Scriptures. No believing theologian will admit the existence of the supernatural in a Biblical narrative to be a proof of myth or legend. Notwithstanding the numerous assaults on the credibility of the Pentateuch, its narratives are likely ere long not only to be universally admitted as historical documents of the highest importance and antiquity, but

as documents which in all essential matters set forth the actual facts of Israelitish history.

9. Wellhausen's views are set forth in *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, 1889, originally in *Jhb. für Deutsch. Theol.*, 1876 and 1877, and in his article on *Israel* in the *Encycl. Britannica*; also in *Proleg. zur Gesch. Israels*, 2nd edit., 1883, and in *Skizzen u. Vorarbeiten*, i. 1884. Similar views are set forth in Kuenen's *Religion of Israel*, English translation, 1874. (See before, p. 8.) E. Reuss, *L'histoire sainte et la loi*, 1879. These views, accepted by many scholars, as Jülicher and Kayser, have been popularised in Great Britain by Professor W. Robertson Smith's *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, 1881, and in America by Professor Toy, of Harvard, and others. On the other side Franz Delitzsch, Hoffmann, Bredenkamp, C. F. Keil (in two articles in Luthardt's *Zeitschrift* for 1885), have come forward; as well as the eminent Roman Catholic scholar G. Bickell. Of importance is V. Ryssel's work, *De Elohistæ Pent. sermone*, 1878. Articles by scholars on both sides, but chiefly in favour of the views advocated by Wellhausen, have appeared in Stade's *Zeitschrift für die Alt-Test. Wissenschaft*. Most important are F. E. König's *Falsche Extreme* (1885), *Hauptprobleme* (1884)—the latter work sadly misrepresented in an English translation (?) entitled *Religion of Israel* (1885). Although important articles have been written on the subject by English scholars, such as Dean R. Payne Smith in his tract on the *Mosaic Authorship* (R.T.S.), Dean Perowne and others in the *Contemporary Review* for 1888, and by Professor Driver, on the *Critical Study of the Old Testament*, in the same magazine for 1890, American scholars have taken up the subject more warmly. Of importance are the contributions of S. I. Curtis's *Levitical Priests*, 1877; his *De Aaronitici Sacerdotii atque Thoræ eloisticæ origine*, 1880; and in the articles in *Current Discussions in Theology* by Chicago Professors (1885 ff. onwards, and elsewhere); E. C. Bissell, *Pent. Origin and Structure*, 1885; W. H. Green, *Hebrew Feasts*, 1886, and many other works and articles; C. Briggs, important

articles on "Higher Criticism" in the *Presbyterian Review*, and the *American Journal of Biblical Literature*; Vos, *Mosaic Origin of Pentateuch Codes*, 1886; *Essays by American Scholars on Pentateuch Criticism*, edited by T. W. Chambers, reviewed by Delitzsch in Luthardt's *Zeitschrift* (1888), and published since in a popular work entitled *Moses and his Recent Critics*, New York, 1889. The discussion on the whole question, carried on in the quarterly *Hebraica*, 1888-1890, between Professor W. R. Harper, of Yale, and Professor W. H. Green, of Princeton, and not yet concluded, is the most minute and important which has yet appeared. Canon Driver's article on the *Critical Study of the Old Testament*, in the February number of *Contemporary Review*, 1890, the subsequent article by Principal Cave, of Hackney College, London, and others can only be alluded to (see App.). Consult also R. Finsler, *Darstellung und Kritik der Ansicht Wellhausen's von Gesch. u. Religion des A. T.*, 1887, reviewed by Baethgen in *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1884, No. 4, and C. E. Johansson, *Den heliga Skrift och den negativa Kritiken*, Upsala, 1886.

10. (a) On the Pentateuch or Hexateuch in general it must be noticed that much valuable matter is contained in the writings of Calvin and the Commentary in the *Critici Saeri* (1695); Henry Ainsworth, *Annotations on Pent.*, 1627, reprinted 1826, 1843; Pfciffer, *Dubia Vex.*, 1704; Clericus, *Comm. in Pent.*, 1733; Geddes, *Critical Remarks*, 1800. Also in the *Einleitungen* or *Introductions* to Old Testament of De Weite, 7th edit. 1852; 8th edit. by Eb. Schrader, 1869. H. A. C. Hävernick, see p. 6; 2nd edit. by C. F. Keil, 1854, 1856. The volume on the *Pentateuch* in English is published by T. and T. Clark; Horne, *Introduction*, 1818, 1856, *Old Testament*, revised by S. Davidson 1860. Bleek, 3rd edit. by Kamphausen, 4th and 5th by Wellhausen, see p. 8; S. Davidson 1862, 1863; J. J. Stähelin, 1862, *Kr. Untersuchungen*, 1843. Also in the articles in *Encycl. Brit.*; Herzog-Plitt, *Encycl.*; Riehm's *Handörterb.*; Smith's *Biblical Dictionary*, etc.; Baumgarten, *Theol. Comm.*, 1843-4. Neteler, B., *Studien über die Echtheit des Pent.*, 2 Parts, 1867, 1871. Smith, George, *Chaldaean Account of Genesis*, new edition

by A. H. Sayce, 1881 ; German edit. with additions by Friedr. Delitzsch, 1876. F. Lenormant, *Les origines de l'histoire d'après la Bible et les traditions*, 1880. J. W. Colenso, *Pentateuch and Book of Joshua*, 1862-1879 ; *Pentateuch and Moabite Stone*, 1873 ; *The New Bible Commentary by Bishops and other Clergy critically examined*, 1874 ; Vatke, *Hist. krit. Einl.*, published after his death by Preiss, 1886 ; Budde, *Bibl. Urgeschichte*, 1883. The *Einl.* of F. H. R. Reusch, 4th edit., 1870 ; Fr. Kaulen, 2nd edit., 1884. The two last are Roman Catholic scholars. De Wette's *Beiträge* appeared in 1806, 1807. Th. Nöldeke's *Untersuchungen* appeared in 1869 ; his *Alt. Test. Lit.* in 1868. A. Th. Hartmann's *Forschungen* appeared in 1831. E. W. Hengstenberg's *Genuineness of Pentateuch*, though extreme, is still of use. It appeared in 1836, 1839 ; English translation published by T. and T. Clark. H. Ewald's *Hist. of the People of Israel*, 3rd Germ. edit., appeared 1864-8. It has been translated into English by Professor Martineau and J. F. Smith. Dean Stanley's *Lectures on the Jewish Church* generally follow Ewald. Other similar works are : Hitzig, *Gesch. des Volkes Isr.*, 1869 ; Stade, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, 1885, 1888 ; E. Renan, *Hist. du peuple d'Israël*, 1887 (unfinished) ; R. Kittel, *Gesch. d. Heb.*, 1888 (unfinished) ; A. Köhler, *Lehrb. d. bibl. Gesch.*, i. 1875 ; ii. 1, 1884 ; ii. 2, 1889, 1890 (unfinished). Graves' *Donnellan Lectures*, 1807, and G. S. Faber's *Horæ Mosaicæ*, 1818, still contain matter of interest. E. Riehm, *Alt-Test. Theologie*, 1889. Of great importance is Eb. Schrader, *Keilinschrift. u. das alt. Test.*, 2nd edit., 1883 ; translated into English, with additions, by Whitehouse, under title, *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*: Williams and Norgate, vol. i., 1885 ; vol. ii., 1888 ; and, on many points, A. Geiger, *Urschrift u. Uebersetzungen*, 1857.

(b) Of Commentaries on the Pentateuch or Hexateuch, besides those named already, the more important are : Rosenmüller's *Scholia in Pent.*, 1795-8 ; still useful. J. S. Vater, 1803-1805. Maurer (ob. 1874), *Comm. gram. crit. in V. T.*, 1835-1848. C. F. Keil, *Genesis and Exodus*, 3rd edit., 1878. *Leviticus to Deuteronomy*, 1870 ; English translation of earlier edition published by T. and T. Clark. A. Knobel on *Genesis*

to *Joshua* (1860 ff.). Dillmann on *Genesis* to *Joshua*; see under special books. J. P. Lange, *Bibelwerk*, on *Genesis*, *Exodus*, *Leviticus*, *Deuteronomy* (by Schroeder); translated in English, with additions, by American scholars; published by T. and T. Clark. In England, in the *Speaker's Commentary*, Bishop Harold Browne has written on *Genesis*; Canon Cook and S. Clark on *Exodus*; T. Espin and J. F. Thrupp on *Numbers* to *Joshua*. In Bishop Ellicott's *Old Testament Commentary*, 1882, Dr. Payne Smith has commented on *Genesis*, Professor G. Rawlinson on *Exodus*, C. D. Ginsburg on *Leviticus*, E. J. Elliott on *Numbers*, C. H. Waller on *Deuteronomy* to *Joshua*. In the *Pulpit Commentary* by Spence and Exell, the commentary on *Genesis* is by W. Whitelaw, on *Exodus* by Professor Rawlinson, at greater length than in Bishop Ellicott's *Commentary*, F. Meyrick has written on *Leviticus*, R. Winterbotham on *Numbers*, W. L. Alexander on *Deuteronomy*, J. J. Lias on *Joshua*, 1881. Important also are: Weill, A., *Le Pentateuque selon Moïse et le Pent. selon Ezra*, Paris, 1886. J. Kennedy, *The Pentateuch: its Age and Authorship*, with an examination of modern theories, 1884. J. P. P. Martin, *Introduction, De l'origine du Pentateuque*, Paris, 1889. A. Westphal, *Les Sources du Pentateuque* (Thèse de Montauban), Toulouse, 1888. R. Kittel, *Gesch. des Hebräer*, I. Quellenkunde u. Gesch. bis zum Tode Josuas, 1888.

(c) The following are of importance, though not, of course, commentaries:—R. Buddensieg, *Die Assyrische Ausgrabungen u. das A. T.*, 1879; Giesebrécht's articles on *Hexateuchkritik* in Stade's *Zeitschrift* for 1881; Prof. Sayce's *Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments*, 1884; E. A. W. Budge, *The Dwellers on the Nile*, 1885. G. Rawlinson, *Moses: Life and Times*, 1887. W. Robertson-Smith, *The Religion of the Semites*, Fundamental Institutions, 1889. Briggs, *Biblical Study: its Principles, Methods, and History* (American), 1883. Henry A. Harper, *The Bible and Modern Discoveries* (from the Palestine Exploration Fund), 1890.

CHAPTER XII.

THE SEVERAL BOOKS OF THE PENTATEUCH.

§ 1. GENESIS.

1. **T**HE name of Genesis is derived from the old Greek version, known by the appellation of the LXX., in which the book is termed γένεσις κόσμου, the *generation*, or *origin of the world*. The book is designated in the Hebrew Bible by its first word בְּרָאָשִׁית. Other names given to it, or to parts, never became general, such as סִפְרֵ יְצָרָה, the *Book of the Creation* (the title also of a famous Kabbalistic work), סִפְרֵ יַשָּׁר the *Book of Jashar*, or the *Book of the Upright* (man), or in the plural סִפְרֵי נְשָׁרִים the *Book of the Upright* (men), or the patriarchs.

Genesis falls into two great divisions. Chapters i.-xi. 9 contain the account of the creation of the world and the primitive history of mankind. This portion concludes with the story of the Deluge, and the account of the scattering abroad of the human race. These histories are most important and contain narratives of the highest antiquity.

For although recent discoveries have brought to light Babylonian narratives strikingly similar in form, the Hebrew narratives exhibit proofs of a still higher antiquity. For example, the Babylonian

account of the deluge speaks of a *ship* (*elippa*), which *sailed*, and was managed by a *steersman*. Such a statement must be assigned to a later era than the account in Genesis, in which mention is made only of a floating *ark*, or hulk, entirely devoid of a rudder, and not designed for sailing at all.

The genealogy of Shem in chap. xi. 10 ff., is introductory to the history of Abraham which follows. The remaining portion of the book is composed of the narratives of the three great patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob or Israel, whose histories, with that of Joseph, Jacob's favourite son, are narrated with considerable fulness of detail down to the period of the going down into Egypt and the sojourn there, with which the book closes. Genesis is not an independent book. It is an introduction to the history of Israel.

2. The Book of Genesis contains distinct traces of having been drawn up from earlier documents. Modern critics have, however, gone too far in the use of "the divining rod," and in the assumption that it is possible to trace its component fragments. Though the composite character of the work may be admitted, the marks of unity of design and of general harmony are equally striking. Some of the conclusions of the critics rest upon premisses absolutely incapable of proof.

3. The following may afford a specimen of the manner in which the documents are considered to have been interlaced with one another. Gen. i., ii., to the middle of ver. 4, is considered to have belonged to the Priests' Code, (PC. or Q). Chap. ii., beginning

with the last clause of verse 4, up to the end of chap. iv., is assigned to the Second Jehovist (J^2) with a few insertions by the Editor, as in chap. ii. 10-14, and single words here and there, including the addition of Elohim after the name Jehovah in the expression Jehovah Elohim ("the LORD God"). The Elder Jehovist (J^1) is used in chap. iv. 16^b-24. Chap. v. is from the Priests' Code up to ver. 32, with the exception of ver. 29, which verse is assigned to the Second Jehovist (J^2). Chap. vi. 1-4 is from the Earlier Jehovist (J^1), verses 5-8 from the Second Jehovist (J^2), with traces of the Editor's hand in the middle of ver. 7. Verses 9-22 are from the Priests' Code (PC or Q). Chap. vii. 1-10 is from the Second Jehovist, ver. 6 being interpolated from the Priests' Code, the word "deluge" which occurs there being inserted by the Editor's hand, as well as the words "male and female" and the name "God" in ver. 9. The original name for the Divine Being in that verse was probably "Jehovah." Verse 11 is assigned to PC, ver. 12 to the Second Jehovist, ver. 13-16 to the PC, the last clause of ver. 16 being from the Jehovist. Verse 17 is a compound of PC, Editor, and Second Jehovist. Verses 18-21 are from the PC; ver. 22 from the Second Jehovist; ver. 23 from the Second Jehovist, with the middle clause from the Editor himself, while ver. 24 is derived from the Priests' Code.

4. Among the most important commentaries on Genesis (besides those mentioned pp. 105, 106), are those by Tuch (*ob.* 1867), 1838, 2nd edit. by Merx and Arnold, 1871; Schumann, *Gen. Heb. et Græce*, 1829; Schröder, 1846; M. M.

Kalisch (in English), 1858 ; Knobel, 1852, 1860 ; Dillmann, 1875, 1886 ; Delitzsch, *Neuer Comm.*, 1887, English translation by T. and T. Clark, 1888, 1889 ; Gossrau, G. W., *Comm. zur Genesis*, 1887 ; C. H. H. Wright, *Gen. in Heb. with gramm. and crit. notes*, 1859 ; E. Böhmer, *Liber Genesis Pentateuchi-
cus*, 1860, a revised Hebrew text, worthy of note as being an attempt to point out the various documents by means of Hebrew types of different sizes. Böhmer's *Das erste Buch der Thora*, 1862 ; T. J. Conant (American), *Genesis*, 1868 ; J. Quarry, *Genesis and its authorship*, 1866, 2nd ed., 1873 ; H. C. Groves, *Comm. on Genesis*, 1861 ; J. G. Murphy (Professor at Belfast), 1863 ; T. Whitelaw, in *Pulpit Comm.*, 1880. M. Dods, *The Book of Genesis*, in T. and T. Clark's *Handbooks for Bible Classes*, 1885 ; and his Commentary in *Expositor's Bible*, 1888. Most important for students of Hebrew is G. J. Spurrell's *Notes on the Hebrew Text of Genesis*, 1887 ; G. Ebers' work, *Aegypten u. die Bücher Mosis* (1868), on Genesis, never reached a second volume ; P. I. Hershon, *Genesis with a Talmudical Commentary*, transl. by Wolkenberg, 1883 ; also his English transl. of Rabbi Jacob's *Tzeénah Ureénah* (1648), under the title of a *Rabb. Comm. on Genesis*, 1885 ; G. Rawlinson, *Moses, his Life and Times*. Of the older commentaries, Calvin, *Comm. in Gen.*, ed. by Hengstenberg, 1838 ; J. Gerhard, 1637 ; Terser (Bishop in Linköping, Sweden), *Adnot. in Genesin*, 1657. Important articles have appeared in Stade's *Alt. Testl. Zeitschrift* ; Luthardt's *Zeitschrift* ; Harper's *Hebraica* ; Harper's *Old and New Test. Student* ; *The Expositor*, etc. Especially interesting is Driver's monograph on *Shiloh* (Gen. xlix. 10), in *Journal of Philology*, vol. xiv. ; J. P. Peters' *Jacob's Blessing*, in *American Journal of Exeg. Soc.*, 1886 ; Friedr. Delitzsch, *Wo lag das Paradies?* 1881, reviewed and summarised in my article on *The Site of Paradise in the Nineteenth Century* for Oct. 1882. Warren's *Paradise Found*, Boston, 1885, is ingenious, but impossible. P. Haupt, *Der keilinschriftliche Sintfluthbericht*, 1881, reviewed, along with Haupt's later contribution to Schrader's *Keilinschriften u. das Alt. Test.* (see p. 103), in my article on the *Babylonian Account of the Deluge in Nineteenth Century* for Feb. 1882. Moritz Engel's

Lösung der Paradiesfrage, 1885, is scarcely more successful than Warren's. Important is *Genesis mit äusserer Unterscheidung der Quellenschriften übers.* v. Kautzsch u. Socin, 1888, 2nd ed., 1891; F. Lenormant, *La Génèse*, 1883, Engl. transl., 1886; Aurivillii, *Dissert. in Gen. xl ix.*; ed. J. H. Michaelis, 1790; L. Diestel (Gen. xl ix.), 1853; J. P. Land, 1858; Papers on the *Cosmogony of Genesis*, by J. D. Dana, and S. R. Driver, in the *Andover Review* and the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for 1887, 1888; and A. Kohut, *The Zendavesta and the First Eleven Chapters of Genesis*, in *Jewish Quarterly Review* for 1890 (April).

§ 2. EXODUS.

1. The name Exodus is derived through the Latin from the Greek Version. The Hebrew title of the book (*מִצְרַיִם* or *מִצְרָיִם*) is taken from its opening words. The Greek word, Latinized *Exodus*, signifies "departure," and occurs in Heb. xi. 22, in allusion to the event which forms the main subject of this book. It, or portions, have occasionally received different names, as "*The Second Book*" (*Sota*, 36 b), *The Book of Injuries* (*יִנְזָרֶת*) after Exod. xxi., xxii. The book divides itself naturally into two parts. I. Chap. i.-xviii. describe (a) the oppression of Israel in Egypt, the history of Moses, his mission to Pharaoh, the plagues sent upon Egypt, i.-xii. 36; (b) the exodus from Egypt, the overthrow of the Egyptians, and Israel's arrival at Sinai (chap. xii. 37-xviii.). II. (a) The encampment before Sinai (chap. xix.), the giving of the Law (chap. xx.-xxiv.). (b) The directions respecting the Tabernacle, with its priests and sacrifices (chap. xxv.-xxxii.) (c) The making of the golden calf, Israel's punishment, the giving of the new tables

(chap. xxxii.-xxxiv.). (d) The erection of the Tabernacle and its dedication (chap. xxxv.-xl.).

2. The four documents, as well as the hand of an editor, can be also traced throughout Exodus. The variation in the names of God, which is a notable mark of the documents in Genesis, disappears after Exod. vi. 2, 3. After that narrative the name Jehovah is systematically employed by the Editor as the peculiar name of God assumed in relation to the covenant with Israel. But the several documents, though lacking that peculiar mark, are still distinguishable by the use of particular words, phrases, etc. The attempt, however, to specify each document too nicely has often led to hyper-criticism.

3. Besides the commentaries mentioned in chap. xi. 10 b, are the English commentaries of Kalisch, 1855; J. G. Murphy, 1866; the additional notes in the English translation of Lange, by C. M. Mead, the American scholar; G. A. Chadwick, in *Expositor's Bible*, 1888; G. Rawlinson, in *Pulpit Commentary*, 1882. Important matter is contained in Köhler's *Bibl. Gesch.*, 1875; Bertholdt, *Ds rebus a Mos. in Egypt. gest.*, 1795; Braunius, *Vest. sacerd. Heb.*, 1698; Birks, *Exodus of Israel*, 1863; Palmer's *Desert of the Exodus*, 2 vols., 1871; H. Brugsch-Bey, *L'Exode et les Monuments Egyptiens*, 1875; also his *Gesch. Ägypt. unter den Pharaonen*, 1877; the supplementary volume to Bunsen's *Bibelwerk*, 1860; F. W. Thayer, *Hebrews and the Red Sea*, 1883 (Amer.); J. Baker Greene, *Hebrew Migration from Egypt*, 3rd edit., 1883; J. P. Peters *The Ten Words in Journ. of Exeg. Soc. (Amer.)*, 1886; G. Ebers, *Durch Gosen nach Sinai*, 1872, 1881; E. Nestle, *Die Eintheilung des Dekalogs*, 1880; A. Edersheim, *The Exodus and the Wanderings in the Wilderness*.

§ 3. LEVITICUS.

1. The name given to this book is a Latinization of the Greek title (*Λευτικόν*). In Hebrew the book is called נִירָא, from the opening word. It is also called in the Talmud תּוֹרַת הַקְרָבָנוֹת the *Law of the Priests*; תּוֹרַת פְּחִימָה the *Law of the gifts*, or *offerings*. The book consists of four parts: I. The laws concerning sacrifices in general (chap. i.-vii.). II. The consecration of Aaron and his four sons, with the punishment of the two eldest of these, Nadab and Abihu (chap. viii.-x.). III. Laws concerning (a) the clean and unclean in food (chap. xi.); personal uncleanness, especially cases of leprosy (chap. xii.-xvi.). (b) The Day of Atonement (chap. xvi.). IV. (a) Laws concerning purity in various forms, including chastity, precepts partly moral and partly ceremonial (chap. xvii.-xix.). Punishments for idolatry and unchastity (chap. xx.). Ordinances as to the persons and ministrations of the priests, and concerning sacrifices (chap. xxi., xxii.). (b) Laws concerning the festivals (chap. xxiii.); the lights of the sanctuary and the shewbread (chap. xxiv. 1-10). The history of a blasphemer and his punishment (chap. xxiv. 10-23). The Sabbath year, and the Jubilee (chap. xxv.). A chapter of blessings and cursings (chap. xxvi.), closing with a kind of appendix containing laws about vows, tithes, and things devoted to Jehovah (chap. xxvii.).

2. The book is considered in the main to have been taken from the Priests' Code, to which chap. i.-xvi. with chap. xxvi. are generally assigned. There is much which appears fragmentary, and which favours

the idea that the code of laws here given was added to from time to time when deemed necessary. The book presents peculiar difficulties in several of its details; but such facts are in themselves evidences of its great antiquity. As a product of the time after the exile it would be a gross anachronism. Its importance in relation to the New Testament doctrine cannot be too highly estimated; but the details of the sacrifices have often been arbitrarily explained as setting forth New Testament doctrines. The writings of the priest-prophet Ezekiel necessarily contain numerous references to the legislation of the book of Leviticus.

3. The leading commentaries on Leviticus have been already mentioned (see pp. 103, 104). Kalisch's *Commentary*, vol. i., 1867, vol. ii., 1872, is important from a critical point of view. Commentaries like those of H. Bonar, 1846, do not face critical difficulties. There are many monographs of importance, such as: Benzinger, *Der grosse Versöhnungstag*, Lev. xvi., in *Zeitschrift für A. T. Wissenschaft*, 1889; Klostermann, *Ueber die Kalendarische Bedeutung des Jobeljahrs* (in the *Stud. u. Kritik.*, 1880); J. J. Stähelin, *Gesch. des Stammes Levi* (in *Zeitschrift d. D. M. G.*, 1855); Graf, *id.* (in Merx, *Archiv*, 1869); Küper, *das Priesterthum des Alt. Bund*, 1865. S. H. Kellogg is the writer on Leviticus in the *Expositor's Bible*, 1891. S. I. Curtiss' works, *De Aaron. sacerd. orig.*, 1878, and his *Levitical Priests*, 1877, are of special importance. H. L. Strack's *Comm. on Genesis to Leviticus* is promised in 1891.

§ 4. NUMBERS.

1. The name in the Hebrew Bible is בְּמִדְבָּר, “*In the Wilderness*,” from the fifth word of chap. i. 1. It is, however, also designated from its initial word

בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל. The appellation *Numbers* is a translation of 'Αριθμοί in the LXX., adopted also by the Vulgate. In the Babl. Talmud (*Sota*, 36 b) it is called סְפִירִים, or חֲמַטֵּשׁ הַפְּקֻדִים, which are of similar import. Each book of the Pentateuch is termed חֲמַטֵּשׁ or חֲמַטֵּשׁ, a *fifth*. The Book of Numbers is so called because it contains the accounts of two *numberings* of the people; the first made in the second year of the Exodus, the second in the fortieth. The book is most suitably divided into four parts. I. The first portion contains chiefly the census (chap. i.-iv.); laws about purity, and about the Nazarites, concluding with the priestly blessing (chap. v., vi.); the offerings of the princes at the dedication of the altar (chap. vii.); the purification of the Levites (chap. viii.); the law of the supplementary passover (chap. ix.); the cloudy pillar, and the directions as to the times and manner of journeying (chap. ix. 15-x.). II. The second portion comprises the history of the journeys of Israel, including the surveying of the land of Canaan, the people's refusal to enter the land, the march back to the wilderness, and various rebellions, inclusive of that of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, which formed the leading events in the history of Israel from the second year to the beginning of the fortieth. Divers laws given during this period are set forth in this part of the book, which includes chap. xi.-xix. III. The third part relates the events of the first ten months of the fortieth year, the toilsome march round Edom, the death of Aaron (chap. xx.); the conquest of the land of the Amorites and of Bashan (chap. xxi.); the episode of Balaam (chap. xxii.-xxiv.). IV. The fourth and last comprises

the account of the sin of Baal-peor (chap. xxv.); the second census (chap. xxvi.); laws about inheritance (chap. xxvii. 1-11 and xxxvi. 1-12); laws of offerings and vows (chap. xxviii.-xxx.); the vengeance taken on the Midianites, and the laws concerning spoil (chap. xxxi.); the settlement of Israel on the country east of Jordan, and the laws of the cities of refuge (chap. xxxii.-xxxv.). The closing chapter (chap. xxxvi.) is supplementary.

2. The Book of Numbers is considered to have been chiefly composed of the Priests' Code, with large additions, however, from the work of the Jehovah or prophetic narrator, especially the sections about Balaam (chap. xxii.-xxiv.). All the four documents are fairly considered to be discoverable in the book, but there are wide differences of opinion as to details.

3. The best commentaries have been named in the foregoing sections. The *Speaker's Commentary* is of interest (see p. 104), and Dillmann's *Commentary on Numbers to Joshua*, 1886, deserves special attention. Monographs on portions of the book : on *Balaam and his Prophecies*, by E. W. Hengstenberg, 1842, English translation published by T. and T. Clark ; by H. Oort, 1860 ; Krüger, *Les oracles de Balaam*, 1873 ; M. M. Kalisch, *Bible Studies*, Part i., *Prophecies of Balaam*, 1877. See Köhler's work, noticed at p. 103.

§ 5. DEUTERONOMY.

1. The name Deuteronomy ("Second Law") is derived from the incorrect rendering given in the LXX., chap. xvii. 18, $\tauὸ\ δευτερονόμιον\ τοῦτο$, for the

phrase correctly translated in the A.V., “a copy of the law,” but which was incorrectly supposed to refer to the whole book itself. The Hebrew name אֱלֹהֶה כְּבָרִים (אֱלֹהֶה כְּבָרִים) or (כְּבָרִים) is taken from the second word in chap. i. 1., viz. “words,” or from the two opening, “these are the words.” The name Δευτερονόμιον occurs in the Ep. of Barnabas x., and in Hippolytus as used by Simon Magus (*Hær.*, vi., 15, 16). In the Massorah the Hebrew name מִשְׁנָה תּוֹרָה, or מִשְׁנָה תּוֹרָה, from Deut. xvii. 18, is also assigned as the name of the book. The book consists mainly of addresses of Moses to the people. I. A rehearsal of the history of Israel from Horeb to the Jordan (chap. i.-iv. 40), closing with a supplementary recital (ver. 41-49). II. A second address commencing with a recital of the Decalogue, and followed by exhortations grounded thereon (chap. v.-xxvi.). The second portion of this address, from chap. xii.-xxvi. 15, is not likely to have actually formed part of the speech delivered, but was added afterwards in writing. III. The opening portion of the third address (chap. xxvii.) seems likewise not to have been spoken, but written down; chap. xxviii., however, looks like the peroration of a great prophecy. IV. Chap. xxix., xxx. formed portions of another prophetic address; chap. xxxi. contains Moses’ charge to Joshua. V. The book closes with a description of Moses’ last days, into which the Song of Moses (chap. xxxii.) and his Blessing of the tribes (chap. xxxiii.) are embedded.

2. The Book of Deuteronomy was evidently intended for the people, and not for the use of the priests alone. New laws are laid down, old laws are abrogated. Compare the law of the one sanctuary as

compared with the earlier legislation (chap. xii. 5-14; comp. Exod. xx. 24). The usage mentioned in Exod. xxiv. 5 was afterwards abrogated by the directions given concerning the priests and Levites. Changes are introduced even into the Decalogue (chap. v. 15, 21). It is incorrect to say that the law of the one sanctuary was unknown till Hezekiah's time, for it underlies all the arrangements as to the Temple made by David and Solomon. 2 Kings xxii. records the discovery of this book in the house of the Lord, the sacred books having been, no doubt, generally destroyed during the persecution in the days of Manasseh. The theory that the book itself was first written at that period is now abandoned by the best critics. It is a matter of great doubt as to when Deuteronomy received its final shape. It is probable that it was added to throughout in later times. But, as a whole, it bears marks of unity of composition, exclusive, of course, of the two poems at the close of the work.

3. In addition to the works already mentioned, pp. 103, 104, see Ed. Riehm, *Die Gesetzgebung Mosis im Lande Moab*, 1854. F. W. Schulz, *Das Deut. erkl.*, 1879, is a work of over 700 pp. The defence of the Mosaic authorship has been abandoned by him in *Die Schöpfungsgeschichte*, etc., 1865. P. Kleinert, *Das Deuteronomium u. der Deuteronomiker*, 1872. Ad. Zahn, *Das Deuteronomium ; eine Schutzschrift wider Modern-Kritisches Unwesen*, 1890. Of the older writers most important are : Lorinus, *Comm.*, 1625, 1628; Masius, in *Crit. Sacri*; Alting, *Opera*, tom. i.; Vitringa, *Comm. ad Cant. Mosis*, 1734; and on the latter song (Deut. xxxii.): J. A. Dathe, *Opusc.*, ed. Rosenmüller, 1796. More modern monographs on Deut. xxxii., are those of W. Volck, 1861; Kamphausen, 1862; A. Klostermann, in *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1871, 1872; Flöckner, 1876;

and on Deut. xxxiii., K. H. Graf., *Der Segen Mosis*, 1857; W. Volck, 1873. The connection between Deuteronomy and the Prophets is discussed among other works in C. J. Bredenkamp, *Gesetz und Propheten*, 1881; Marti, *Die Spuren d. sogen. Grundschrift d. Hex. in den vorexil. Proph. (Jahrb. f. Prot. Theol.)*, vi., 1880); F. E. König, *Der Offenbarungsbegriff des alt. Test.* (2 vols.), 1882, etc.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE HISTORICAL BOOKS.

§ 1. THE Book of JOSHUA.

1. **T**HE name of Joshua was originally חֹשֶׁעַ Hoshea, “*salvation*” (Num. xiii. 8, 6), a name borne by the last king of Israel (2 Kings xv. 30), and by the prophet of the northern kingdom, though variously transliterated in our A.V. That name was afterwards changed to יְהוָשָׁעַ (twice written *plene* יְהֹוָשָׁעַ, Deut. iii. 21; Judges ii. 7), which signifies *Jahaveh is salvation*, or *Jahaveh saves*. Comp. אֶלְيָשָׁעַ, the name of one of David’s sons (2 Sam. v. 15), akin to אֶלְיָשָׁעַ, the name of the great prophet Elisha. The latter form, יְהוָשָׁעַ, is written by the LXX. and in later Greek Ἰησοῦς (Acts vii. 45; Heb. iv. 8).

The Book of Joshua is the concluding portion of the Hexateuch. In the Hebrew canon it is the first of those books grouped together under the designation of the “former prophets” (נ֬בִיאִים רָאשׁוֹנִים). The historical books from Joshua to 2 Kings are embraced under that title, with the single exception of the Book of Ruth.

2. The Book of Joshua may be divided into three parts. I. Chap. i.-xii. give an account of the conquest of Canaan. II. Chap. xiii.-xxii. describe the

division of the land among the tribes. III. The two closing chapters (xxiii. and xxiv.) contain the last speeches of Joshua, and an account of the deaths of Joshua and Eleazar.

3. The Book of Joshua is so called after the name of the great captain whose exploits it records. It does not profess, however, to have been written by him, although ascribed to him by Jewish and Christian commentators prior to the rise of the modern school of Biblical criticism. Internal evidence is opposed to the opinion of the older authorities. No conclusion as to the late date of the book can, however, be drawn from its language, although that line of argument was at one time adopted by critics. But the book records events which occurred after the death of Joshua, such as the capture of Hebron by Caleb, and of Kiriath Sepher by Othniel (comp. Josh. xv. 13-17 with Judges i. 9-13). Several facts mentioned in the book show that it must have been written very early. Ai, or Aiath, was in ruins at the time of the writer (chap. viii. 28), although in existence as a town in the days of Hezekiah. The story of the Gibeonites must have been earlier than the attempt made to root them out by Saul (Josh. ix. 27). The reference to the Jebusites in Jerusalem (chap. xv. 63) appears earlier than the time of David. The statement that the Canaanites dwelt in Gezer (chap. xvi. 10) must also have been earlier than the conquest of Gezer in the days of Solomon (1 Kings ix. 16). These facts are in favour of the great antiquity of the entire Hexateuch. If the Hexateuch concluded with Joshua, its composition must have been long prior to the Exile. The Book

of Joshua is seldom assigned to a later date than the days of Jeremiah. But it is hard on any fair line of argumentation to defend the composition of such a book at that period.

3. The documents used in the composition of the Pentateuch have been traced also in the Book of Joshua. In the first part of the book the Jehovah is conspicuous; in the afterparts the Priests' Code, and even the Deuteronomist. Other documents were also made use of. The Book of Jashar is referred to in chap. x. 13. There are difficulties in connection with several of the statements in the Book of Joshua, but the difficulties have often been exaggerated. The expulsion of the Canaanites and the conquest of the land by Israel are often referred to in the later books. The miracles narrated in the book have also been often grossly exaggerated. Orthodox scholars, like Dr. E. W. Hengstenberg, have long ago pointed out that, although the victory gained at Gibeon (chap. x.) was brought about by supernatural causes, it is not necessary to assert as an historical fact that the sun or the moon stood still on that occasion.

4. Among the special commentaries on Joshua may be named the work of Masius, a Roman Catholic scholar, 1574, still in high repute; that of J. Clericus in *Comm. in Libb. Hist.*, 1708; Osiander, 1681; Corn. a Lapide (Roman Catholic), *Josh.-2 Paral.* 1642; C. a Lapide was an able expositor, and wrote commentaries on nearly all the books of the Bible. Maurer, *Comm. über Josua*, 1831; Rosenmüller, *Scholia*, 1833; Keil, 1847 (*Joshua, Richter, und Ruth*), 1863: English translation publ. by T. and T. Clark. Knobel (*Numb.-Josh.*), 1861; Dillmann (*Numb.-Josh.*), 1886; Himpel on the unity and credibility of book, in *Tüb. Theol. Quartalschr.*, 1864; Hollenberg, *die deut. Bestandtheile in*

Stud. u. Kr., 1874 (see other Commentaries on Hex. noted in chap. xi.) ; G. F. Maclear, 1883, in Cambridge Bible ; J. Lloyd, *Book of Joshua, Crit. and Expos. Comm.*, 1886, useful for students, but not up to date ; J. J. Lias has written on the book in the *Pulpit Commentary*, 1881, and Canon Espin in the *Speaker's Commentary*. The *Book of Joshua* by Rev. Principal Douglas, D.D. (T. and T. Clark), 1890 ; T. J. Conant, *Hist. Books of the Old Test.* (Joshua to 2 Kings) ; *Introductions, common version revised, and occasional Notes*, New York, 1884. See *Appendix*.

5. The Samaritans possess among writings peculiar to them a Book of Joshua, attention to which was first called by Scaliger. The MS. of this work, which he brought to Europe, is in the University Library at Leyden. The work has been edited by Juynboll, under the name *Chronicon Samaritanum*, 1848. It is in Arabic, written in the Samaritan character, and contains an epitome of Israelitish history during the last days of Moses. Its opening chapters correspond with Num. xxii.-xxxii. Next follows the Book of Joshua according to the Hebrew, with, however, several additions and legends. According to these Samaritan additions, Joshua built the temple on Mount Gerizzim. The work is post-Christian in date, for it contains in its closing portion a history of the Samaritans to the time of the Emperor Alexander Severus. There is, also, another work of the Samaritans, entitled, *The Book of Joshua*, composed by Abulfatch, in the year of the Hejira 756. The latter work, which is of no historical value, has been edited by Vilmar, with a Latin translation and commentary, 1865, and is interesting from the Samaritan history it contains.

§ 2. THE Book of JUDGES.

1. The Book of the Judges, שֹׁפְטִים, *Kpirai* (comp. Acts xiii. 20), receives its name from the heroes who “judged Israel.” These were noted for their martial prowess in repelling the assaults made either by various nations in the proximity of Canaan, who sought to enslave the new settlers in that land, or by the aboriginal populations, who were but partially subdued, and possessed still many portions of the country. The Hebrew “Judges” administered justice in times of peace, and acted as generals in time of war. They were, therefore, akin to the *Suffetes*, who, after the overthrow of royalty in Tyre, acted as rulers there, as also in Carthage (*Liv. Hist.*, xxx. 7). The title is identical. The Suffetes at Carthage were sometimes styled by the Romans *reges*, *consules*, and *dictators*.

2. The Book of Judges is composed of three parts : I. The first portion (chap. i.-ii. 5) is introductory, describes the conquest of certain parts of the land, and gives a list of the cities which had not yet come into the possession of the Israelites. It is open to serious question whether the rebuke of Israel at Bochim was administered by a *prophet* or by an *angel*. The Hebrew phrase, מֶלֶךְ יְהוָה, *messenger*, or *angel* of Jehovah, is ambiguous ; but the expression “came up from Gilgal to Bochim” coincides better with the former explanation. II. The second portion of the book consists of chap. ii. 6 to xvi. inclusive. This part is closely connected with Josh. xxiv. 28. It records the history of Israel from the death of Joshua to that of Samson, and also commences with an intro-

duction in prophetic style (chap. ii. 16-iii. 6), after which follow sketches of twelve or fifteen Judges, of the greater number of whom very little account is given. (1) *Othniel* of the tribe of Judah, chap. iii. 7-11. (2) *Ehud* of the tribe of Benjamin, chap. iii. 12 ff. (3) *Shamgar*, chap. iii. 31. (4 and 5) *Deborah* of Ephraim and *Barak* of Naphtali, chap. iv., v. (6) *Gideon* of Manasseh, chap. vi.-viii. (7) *Abimelech*, son of Gideon's maid-servant; a petty king, not probably one of the Judges, chap. ix.. (8) *Tola* of Issachar, chap. x. 1, 2. (9) *Jair* of Gilead, chap. x. 3, 4. (10) *Jephthah* of Gilead, chap. xi., xii. (11) *Ibzan* of Bethlehem, chap. xii. 8. (12) *Elon* of Zebulon, chap. xii. 11, 12. (13) *Abdon* of Ephraim, chap. xii. 13-15. (14) *Samson* of Dan, chap. xiii.-xvi. By the omission of the names of Deborah and Abimelech, the total number has often been reduced to twelve. No weight, however, is assigned to the number twelve in the book, and it is doubtful whether the name of *Shamgar* be not an interpolation. *Bedan*, who is mentioned in 1 Sam. xii. 11, is either to be identified with Barak (which is the reading found in that passage in the LXX. and Syr.), or possibly may be the same as *Abdon*. It is a matter of uncertainty whether the rule of the Judges mentioned in the book was consecutive or contemporaneous, and the book does not afford data enough for the solution of the question. III. The third portion of the book (chap. xvii.-xxi.) contains two remarkable narratives. (a) The first recounts the circumstances which led to the image worship set up at Dan, chap. xvii., xviii.; and (b) the second tells of the "deed of shame"

performed at Gibeah, and the subsequent "holy war" against Benjamin, chap. xix.-xxi. The events recorded in the former must have occurred at a very early period, prior to the narratives recorded after chap. iii. 12. See chap. xviii. 1, although if this be correct, chap. xviii. 31 contains a later gloss. The second narrative must also be assigned to a very early period, according to chap. xx. 28.

3. The Book of Judges, though probably put together by a single editor, contains histories proceeding from different authors. The opening words, "and it came to pass after the death of Joshua," may be a later addition, inserted in order to unite the book with the preceding Book of Joshua. The Song of Deborah and Barak affords abundant proof of having been composed shortly after the date of the event celebrated. It has been conjectured that the Book of Judges originally contained the history of Eli and Samuel. The date of the composition of the work is uncertain, for the reference in chap. xviii. 30 to "the captivity of the land" may be a later gloss, or may contain a faulty reading. "The captivity of the land" must mean the Assyrian captivity, and hence if those words be genuine the work must have been composed after that period. But the thorough knowledge shown of the topography of Palestine is sufficient to prove the book to have been written by an inhabitant of the country, and therefore it cannot well have been composed during the Babylonian Exile. Several of the events recorded in the book are alluded to in Psalms lxxviii. and lxxxiii. The "iniquity of Gibeah" is referred to in Hosea ix. 9, x. 9.

4. The commentaries on Judges are numerous. Among the most important are those of Clericus; Drusius, 1586; Schmidt, 1684; Rosenmüller, *Scholia*, 1835; G. L. Studer, *Das Buch der Richter*, 1835; 2nd edit., 1842; E. Bertheau, *Richter, u. Ruth*, 1845; 2nd edit., 1883; Paulus Cassel, in Lange's *Bibelwerk*, 1865, 2nd edit., 1887; Bachmann, *Richter*, I. i.-v. 1868, 1869. Keil (see pp. 6, 7); H. Ewald (see p. 7), and A. Köhler (p. 103), in their historical works; as well as S. Davidson, Stähelin, Bleek, Wellhausen, in their *Introductions* (p. 8); also the latter in his *Gesch. Israel*, i., 1878. E. Reuss, *Gesch. d. heilig. Schriften*, 1889; see on the book Oehler, *Theologie des A. T.*, 2nd edit., 1882; English transl. by T. and T. Clark. Wahl, *Ueber den Verf. des B. der Richter*, 1859; K. A. Auberlen in *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1860; J. J. Lias, *Book of Judges*, in Cambridge Bible for Schools, 1890. G. C. M. Douglas, *The Book of Judges*, T. and T. Clark, 1881. R. A. Watson, *Judges and Ruth* in *Expositor's Bible*. Lord A. C. Hervey (Bishop of Bath and Wells) has written on *Judges* in *Pulpit Commentary*, 1881; and also in the *Speaker's Commentary*, 1872. T. Skat Rördam, *Libri Judicum et Ruth*, sec. vers. *Syr.-Hexaplarem*, 1861, is useful; also K. Budde, *Die Bücher Richter u. Samuel, ihr Quellen und ihr Aufbau*, 1890; A. Köhler, *Lehrb. d. Bibl. Gesch.* ii., pp. 21-121, 1884.

The Song of Deborah has produced a large number of monographs. Among the most important are Schnurrer, *Dissert. philol. criticæ*, 1790; Hollmann, 1818; Kalkar, 1833; H. H. Kemink, 1840; v. Gumpach, *Alt. Test. Studien*, 1852; E. Meier, 1859; Dr. J. W. Donaldson, *Book of Jashar*, 2nd ed., 1860; Böttcher, *Der Debora-Gesang u. das Hohelied*, 1850; H. Ewald, *Die Dichter d. alt. Bundes*, I., 1866; Hilliger, 1867; Aug. Müller, 1887. On other points, see K. Budde, on *Richter und Josua* in *Zeitschrift für die A. T. Wissenschaft* for 1887, and Stade himself in the same for 1881. Also by Budde, *Die Anhänge des Richterbuches* in the same *Zeitschrift* for 1888; W. Böhme, *Die älteste Darstellung in Richt. vi. 11-24 und xiii. 2-24*, in same *Zeitschrift* for 1885. S. R. Driver, *Origin and Structure of the Book of Judges*, in *Jewish Quarterly Review* for April 1889.

§ 3. THE Book of RUTH.

1. The Book of Ruth (רָוֹת, 'Poúθ) in the Hebrew canon does not immediately follow the Book of Judges, but is one of the five *Megilloth* or “*Rolls*,” which form part of the Hagiographa, or כתובים, which is the last division of the Hebrew canon. In it the book follows immediately after Psalms, Proverbs, Job. The LXX. and Josephus place Ruth immediately after Judges. The events of the book occurred about a century before the time of David. The genealogy at the end of the book is brought down to David. The book records the intermarriage of an Israelite with a Moabitess, which is sufficient to show that it is historical, and does not belong to the region of the poetical. After the Exile such a fact would not have been regarded as creditable to a pious Israelite. The historical character of the story is also confirmed by the friendly intercourse recorded between David and the king of Moab in 1 Sam. xxii. 3, 4. The so-called “Chaldaisms” found in the book are probably better regarded as instances of the spoken patois. The law of the levirate (Deut. xxv. 7-9) is not that referred to in chap. iv. 7. The genealogy at the end of the book may be incomplete, but even that point is open to dispute. No certain date can be assigned for the authorship of the book, only that it must have been written after the time of David and long prior to the Exile.

2. The best older commentaries on Ruth are those by Schmidt, *Comm. in Lib. Ruth*, 1696; Carpzov, *Colleg. rabb. bibl. in lib. Ruth*, 1703. Of the later critics, Rosenmüller, Bertheau,

Keil and P. Cassel, Aubérlen, have been mentioned under *Judges*; Metzger, *Lib. Ruth ex Heb. in Lat. vers. perpet. interp. illust.* 1857; C. H. H. Wright, *The Book of Ruth in Heb. and Chald. with crit. text. and gram. and crit. comm.*, 1864; F. de Hummelauer (Roman Catholic), *Comm. in libros Judicum et Ruth*, 1888. J. Morison has written on Ruth in the *Pulpit Commentary*, 1881; and Lord A. C. Hervey, Bishop of Bath and Wells, in the *Speaker's Commentary*, 1881. See E. Reuss in *Strassburger Revue*, Band vii.

§ 4. THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL.

1. These books are so called, not because Samuel was supposed to have been the author, but because that prophet is the most important character in the opening portion. The title is most unsuitable. In the LXX. the books are more correctly termed Βασιλειῶν πρώτη, δευτέρα, *First* and *Second Kings*, which is their name in the Vulgate. The two books are in reality a single work, and are so regarded in Hebrew MSS. The division into first and second books was made after the introduction of printing, and was derived from the LXX. and Vulgate. According to the Talmud (*Baba Bathra*, 14^b, 15^a), Samuel wrote Judges, Ruth, and Samuel. The reference made in 1 Chron. xxix. 29 to "the history of Samuel the seer," is somewhat doubtful. See remarks on *Chronicles*, p. 135.

The Books of Samuel contain mainly the histories of Samuel, Saul, and David. I. 1 Sam. i.-xii. traces the history of Samuel down to his retirement from the position of a Judge over Israel. The history of Eli and his times is only incidentally narrated. II.

The history of Saul from his accession to the throne down to his death on Mount Gilboa, 1 Sam. xiii.-2 Sam. i. Two important songs are contained in this part. (*a*) The Song of Hannah, 1 Sam. ii. 1-10; and (*b*) the Lament of David over Saul and Jonathan, 2 Sam. i. 19-27. III. The reign of David, 2 Sam. ii. to the end. The sources from whence the book was composed were partly oral and partly written. The Book of Jashar is referred to in 2 Sam. i. 18. One of the Psalms (Ps. xviii.) with certain modifications appears in 2 Sam. xxii. The author of the Book of Chronicles mentions (1 Chron. xxvii. 24) "the chronicles of king David." "The history of Samuel the seer," "the history of Nathan the prophet," and "the history of Gad the seer," are referred to in 1 Chron. xxix. 29 as authorities extant in the writer's day, for "the acts of David first and last." There seems to have been a book written by Samuel which contained at least the law of the kingdom, 1 Sam. x. 25. It is therefore highly probable that the compiler of the Books of Samuel had those records before him. 2 Sam. xxi.-xxiv. partakes of the character of an appendix to the work.

2. The editor interwove into his narrative different accounts of the same transaction. Whether those accounts are necessarily discordant is quite another question. Some of the variations can be harmonised without difficulty, *e.g.* the three accounts of Saul's elevation to the throne (chap. viii., ix. 1-x. 16, xi.). Other narratives, *e.g.* the accounts of David's first introduction to Saul are more difficult to bring into harmony. The compiler was, however, by no means

the simple-minded blunderer which some critics have represented him to have been. The text of the work is generally admitted to have come down to us in a very corrupt form (see 1 Sam. xiii. 1, and 2 Sam. xxi. 19). Arguments based, therefore, upon the numbers mentioned in the book (*e.g.* 1 Sam. vi. 19), and even on the names of persons and places, must be received with caution. The text of the LXX. in many places differs much from the Hebrew. Many critical conjectures have been made in the way of correcting the text, but the critics are very much divided in opinion. The book must have been composed after the division of the kingdoms of Judah and Israel (see 1 Sam. xxvii. 6), but was in the main drawn up probably not very long after that crisis. The work seems to have undergone revision at a later period, when it was brought into close connection with the Book of the Kings. It may have proceeded from several authors, but such points must ever remain, more or less, matters of pure conjecture.

3. The best commentaries on the Books of Samuel are those of Seb. Schmidt, 1687, although it is verbose, extending over 2,000 pp. 4to ; of Clericus, 1708 ; Hensler, *Erläuterungen des 1 Buch*, 1795 ; Thenius, *Die Bücher Sam. erklärt*, 2te Ausg., 1864 ; Keil, 2te Aufl., 1864 ; English translation published by T. and T. Clark ; Erdmann, in *Lange's Bibelwerk*, English translation published by T. and T. Clark, with notes by American scholars ; Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bb. Samuelis untersucht*, 1871 ; Himpel, *Ueber Widersprüche u. versch. Quellenschriften (Tüb. Theol. Quartalschr.)*, 1874 ; A. F. Kirkpatrick (Reg. Prof. Heb. at Camb.), *1 Samuel*, 1885 ; *2nd Samuel*, 1884, in Cambridge Bible ; R. Payne Smith in two vols. of the *Pulpit Commentary*, 1880. Klostermann's *Die*

Bücher Samuelis und der Könige, 1887 (in Strack and Zöckler's *Kurzgefasstes Komm.*), contains important critical remarks, but Driver's work, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, etc., 1890, is of more importance to the critic and scholar. F. de Hammelauer, (Roman Catholic), *Comm. in Libb. Sam.*, Paris, 1886. Important is F. H. Woods, *Light thrown on the LXX. Vers. of the Books of Samuel*, *Studia Bibl.*, vol. i. Oxford, 1885; C. H. Cornill, *Ein elohistisch Bericht in 1 Sam. i.-xv. aufgezeigt*, in Luthardt's *Zeitschrift*, 1885, and concluded in the *Königsberger Studien*, Band i.; K. Budde, *Saul's Königswahl u. Verwerfung* in *Zeitschrift für A. T. Wissenschaft*, 1888. The historical works of Ewald, Reuss, Köhler, as well as the *Introductions* of Bleek, Davidson and others, with the articles in the larger Bible Dictionaries, ought not to be forgotten. W. G. Blaikie has published two vols. on First and Second Samuel in the *Expositor's Bible*. Also K. Budde, *Die Bücher Richter u. Samuel, ihre Quellen und ihr Aufbau*, 1890.

§ 5. THE BOOKS OF THE KINGS.

1. These two books formed originally one, under the title **ספר מלכים** (see Origen in *Euseb. Hist. Eccl.*, vi. 25); but they were afterwards divided in the LXX., where they are designated respectively *Βασιλειῶν τρίτη καὶ τετάρτη*, and so in the Vulgate 3 and 4 Kings. The division found in the LXX. was adopted in the printed Hebrew text from the Bomberg printed editions. In the MSS. and in the earliest printed editions the books appear as one. The narrative falls into three parts. I. The reign of Solomon, chap. i.-xi. II. A synchronical account of the kingdom of Judah and Israel until the captivity of Israel, 1 Kings xii.-2 Kings xvii. III. The history of the kingdom of Judah down to the Babylonian conquest and the exile

of the people, 2 Kings xviii.-xxv. The compiler refers to the following sources from which his history was composed: (1) The book of the acts of Solomon, 1 Kings xi. 41. (2) The books of the chronicles of the kings of Judah (1 Kings xiv. 29) up to the death of Jehoiakim. (3) The books of the chronicles of the kings of Israel up to the death of Pekah (see p. 134). The chronicles referred to were not the official records themselves, but probably books compiled therefrom, written shortly before the Exile. The constant expression used, "unto this day," has been fairly adduced as a proof of this conjecture. The latter phrase evidently presupposes the existence of the kingdom of Judah, and cannot refer to the Exile. The histories of Elijah and Elisha were taken from some other sources, and are among the most remarkable portions of the work. The histories of those two great prophets are in many respects singularly akin to the histories of John the Baptist and Christ in the New Testament. But Elijah's character and the work he performed in Israel, as set forth in the Book of Kings, towers in most respects far above that of Elisha. The latter prophet, however, appears to have made more provision, than his predecessor Elijah seems to have done, for the continuance of his work after his death. The religious object and design of the Book of Kings is fully apparent from the reflections made on the events recorded, especially in 2 Kings xvii. The Book of Kings contains the only account of the history of the kingdom of Israel after the great disruption, for the Book of Chronicles gives no separate history of the northern kingdom.

2 Many of the old commentators are deserving of attention; among the Fathers, especially Ephrem Syrus and Theodoret. Among the Reformers and the scholars of that century, the works of Bugenhagen and Strigelius deserve notice, and in the succeeding century those of Leonhardi, Sanctius, Schmidt, and Clericus. Among the special commentaries of this century on the book, the more important are those of Keil, 1845 and 1864; and Thenius, 1849, 1873; Bähr, in Lange's *Biblewerk*; Klostermann (see on *Samuel*, p. 129). Many important contributions have been made on special points by Kern, Oehler, O. Wolff, H. Brandes, and Wellhausen. Most important on this book is the information given by Schrader in his *Keilinschriften und das Alt-Test.*, ably translated by Rev. O. C. Whitehouse, 1885, 1888 (see p. 103). See also B. Stade, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel unter der Königsherrschaft*, 1887; Dr. W. Wright (of British and Foreign Bible Society), *The Empire of the Hittites*, 2nd edit., 1886; J. R. Lumby, *First Book of Kings*, with Introduction and Notes, 1886; *Second Kings*, 1887: in Cambridge Bible for Schools. Useful for popular purposes is G. Rawlinson, *Lives and Times of Kings of Israel and Judah*, 1889. J. Hammond has written on 1 Kings in the *Pulpit Commentary*, 1881, Prof. G. Rawlinson on 2 Kings in the same work, and in the *Speaker's Commentary*. A. Edersheim, *History of the Kings of Judah and Israel*, 1880. J. Halévy, *Manassé roi de Judah*, in the *Revue des Études Juives*, 1881.

§ 6. THE BOOKS OF THE CHRONICLES.

1. The Books of the Chronicles are styled in Hebrew בְּבִיאַת הַיּוֹם, the *Acts* or *Annals of the Days*. In the Hebrew the two books form one great historical work. The LXX. divided the work into two books, styling them Παραλειπόμενα, *things passed over*, or *omitted*. The Latin has followed the LXX. in the division of the book, but has retained the name *Paralipomenon* (genitive plur. after

Liber) which is also used in the Douay Version. Jerome, in his *Prologus galeatus*, suggested the title *Chronicon* as preferable, whence the name *Chronicles*. The book supplements in several points that of the Kings, and is written even from a more distinctly religious and Levitical standpoint than the former work. Hence the history of the northern kingdom, which, by the sin of Jeroboam had apostatised from the covenant, is only given as far as it came into connection with that of Judah. The book is naturally divided into four parts. I. 1 Chron. i.-ix., consisting of genealogies from Adam, some of which are brought down to a date beyond the Captivity (see chap. iii.). Those genealogies present many difficulties, some of which are insoluble, owing to the absence of other data. The genealogies taken from Genesis are design-
edly curtailed. Information, in addition to that found in Genesis, is given in some instances. These facts give a peculiar importance to the later portions of those genealogies. II. 1 Chron. x.-xxix. gives the history of David, which is remarkable both for the omissions which occur in the narrative, and also for the many new facts recorded which are not given in the Book of the Kings. III. The reign of Solomon (2 Chron. i.-ix.), in which the omissions are many, and the additions, though few, are by no means wanting in signification. IV. The history of the kings of Judah up to the Captivity (2 Chron. x.-xxxvi.). The additions made in this portion are of special interest.

2. The Book of Chronicles was composed after the Exile. It was not designed to be merely a supple-

ment to the Book of Kings. It is in several respects an independent history, and evidently not intended to supersede the Book of Kings, from which no inconsiderable portion of its contents is derived. Many sections agree almost verbally with that of the Kings, while the knowledge of the history contained in that book is presupposed in several places; *e.g.* the reference to Elijah (2 Chron. xxi. 12-16) takes for granted that the reader is well acquainted with the history of that prophet. A knowledge of the sayings of Elijah and of the acts of Elisha is also presupposed in 2 Chron. xxii. 7, 8. Hence we cannot agree with those critics who suppose that the omissions in the work were made for the purpose of concealing facts discreditable to certain kings. The compiler of the work was probably a Levite interested in the music of the Second Temple. The sources of the history appear to have been numerous. The editor was acquainted with both the Books of Samuel and Kings in a somewhat similar form to that in which we have them, and he quotes from both. His authorities were: (1) *The Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel.* This authority is frequently referred to. It is hard to decide whether several books are not quoted under that name. For “the book of the kings of Israel” is spoken of in 2 Chron. xx. 34, and “the acts” or “history” of the kings of Israel in 2 Chron. xxxiii. 18; the most common reference being to “the book of the kings of Judah and Israel” (2 Chron. xvi. 11, xxv. 26), or to “the book of the kings of Israel and Judah” (2 Chron. xxvii. 7, etc.). The “book or “history” referred to cannot be identified with the Book of Kings, because

it contained histories of events not found in that work. (2) *The history of Samuel the seer.* This work may possibly have been the well-known Book of Samuel. (3) The history of *Nathan* the prophet. (4) The history of *Gad* the seer. All these are referred to in 1 Chron. xxix. 29; and the work of *Nathan* with (5) the *prophecy of Ahijah*, and (6) the *visions of Iddo* in 2 Chron. ix. 29; and the last-mentioned possibly in 2 Chron. xiii. 22. Iddo is also referred to in connection with the (7) *history of Shemaiah*, 2 Chron. xii. 15. (8) The history of *Jehu the son of Hanani*, 2 Chron. xx. 34. (9) The *Midrash*, or Commentary on the Book of the Kings, 2 Chron. xxiv. 27. But the translation "commentary" is doubtful. (10) A book of *Isaiah* about Uzziah, 2 Chron. xxvi. 22, as well as (11) the *Vision of Isaiah*, 2 Chron. xxxii. 32. (12) The history of *Hozai*, or of the *Seers*, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 19. It is, however, a matter of dispute whether some of those books may not be merely sections of a large history (compare the expression in Rom. xi. 2, ἐν Ἡλείᾳ). The writer may have lived as late as the early portion of the Grecian period, as has been conjectured from his reference to Persian coins (1 Chron. xxix. 7), and especially from the genealogy in 1 Chron. iii. 19-24, which is traced for several generations after Nehemiah. The compiler probably lived a century after that governor. Some critics place the work as late as the early days of Alexander the Great. It closes abruptly in the middle of a sentence. The last three verses are identical with the three first of Ezra, in which latter place the

sentence left unfinished in the Chronicles is completed. The book may have been originally united with that of Ezra, and have proceeded from the same writer. According to Jewish tradition Ezra was the compiler; but the genealogy already referred to is opposed to that view. The text is considerably corrupted in some parts of the work, especially in the case of proper names, and in the numbers mentioned. Some critics consider the work inferior in historical credibility to the Kings. But the compiler, as already noted, actually presupposes in many cases an acquaintance with the former book, and the omissions in his history are not to be regarded as discrepancies. There are, however, many difficulties which become apparent on a careful comparison of the two books, and which are not yet capable of satisfactory solution.

3. Most of the works recommended on the Kings can also be consulted with advantage on the Book of Chronicles. Many commentators have commented on both books. On the Book of Chronicles in particular the following works are of special importance: C. B. Michaelis, *Annot. in Paralip.* in his *Uberiores Annot. in Hagiographa*, 3 vols., 1719, 1720, and the later commentaries of Bertheau, 1854, 2te Aufl., 1873; Keil, 1870; Zöckler, in Lange's *Bibelwerk*, 1874; in the English edition important additions have been made by American scholars. S. Oettli has written on *Die geschichtl. Hagiographa* in Strack-Zöckler's *Kurzgefasst. Komm.*, 1889. The work of Klostermann, 1887 (see p. 129) must not be forgotten. Note also Caspari's monograph on the *Syr.-Ephr. Krieg*, mentioned under *Isaiah*. Useful for teachers is Rev. Dr. Murphy on *The Books of the Chronicles*, T. and T. Clark, 1880. Rev. Prof. P. C. Barker has written on 1 and 2 Chron. in *Pulpit Comm.* and C. J. Ball in *Bp. Ellicott's Comm.*

§ 7. THE BOOKS OF EZRA AND NEHEMIAH.

1. The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah are in Hebrew MSS. regarded as one, and are designated the Book of Ezra (see also Josephus, *Against Apion*, i. 8). In the later Hebrew Bibles, and in the LXX., the work was correctly divided into two books. In the LXX. the books are styled Second Esdras and Nehemiah. See remarks on pp. 138, 139. The Vulgate terms the two canonical books respectively First and Second Esdras. The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, though proceeding from different authors, were, in all probability, originally part and parcel of the Chronicles. Each of the two books falls into two sections. I. *Ezra* (a) chap. i.-vi. treats of the return of the exiles under Sheshbazzar, or Zerubbabel, b.c. 536, when Joshua was high priest, and of the rebuilding of the temple, accomplished in the sixth year of Darius, b.c. 516. The period is described in the contemporary writings of Haggai and Zechariah. (b) The second portion (chap. vii.-x.) relates the events which occurred half a century later. The second expedition from Babylon occurred in the seventh year of the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus (b.c. 458-457), and was led by Ezra to Jerusalem. On this occasion the expulsion of the foreign wives took place. More than one-fourth of the exiles who returned with Zerubbabel did not belong to the tribes of Judah or Benjamin, but were members of the other tribes (see Wright's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 279). The number of individuals belonging to the other ten tribes was about 12,000, out of a gross total of 42,360. No impediment, as far as we know, was

placed in the way of the return of all the Israelites. Many thousands, no doubt, returned at a later period, although the bulk of all the tribes preferred to remain in the land of their dispersion. There is no full account of the Return, because a blank of a century and a half exists in the Jewish annals of the period.

II. Nehemiah. (a) Neh. i.-vii. 73a relate his journey from Shushan in the twentieth year of the reign of Artaxerxes (B.C. 445-444), and the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem. (b) The second portion—Neh. vii. 73b to end—describes the work of the restoration of religion, brought about by the united efforts of Nehemiah and Ezra. This includes the solemn reading of the Law to all Israel (chap. viii. 1-12), the keeping of the Feast of Tabernacles (chap. viii. 13-18), the great confession (chap. ix.), the sealing of the covenant by the chiefs of the people (chap. x.), the list of the returned exiles (chap. xi., xii. 1-26), the dedication of the walls (chap. xii. 27-xiii. 3), and the correction of divers abuses (chap. xiii. 4-31).

Considerable portions of the two books are no doubt derived from the memoirs of Ezra and Nehemiah; but it does not follow that the books in their present shape were the works of those authors. A portion of Ezra (chap. iv. 8 to chap. vi. 18) with chap. vii. 11-26 is written in Aramaic (Chaldee), see p. 193. The mention of Jaddua (high priest in the time of Alexander the Great) in Neh. xii. 11, 22 seems to prove that the work must have been composed later than the time of Nehemiah.

2. The apocryphal Book of Ezra requires some notice here. It is called in the LXX. and Syr. the First Book of Esdras

or Ezra, and is placed in those Versions immediately before Ezra, which is then called Second Esdras. In the Vulgate, however, the book is known as Third Esdras, and usually placed along with Fourth Esdras at the end of the New Testament along with the *Prayer of Manasses*, these three books not being regarded as canonical by the Roman Catholic Church. The apocryphal Book of Ezra is for the most part a compilation out of 2 Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah; mainly, however, from the Book of Ezra. It is of some importance in connection with the criticism of the text of Ezra, although inferior in authority, and abounding in contradictory statements. The book seems to have been left unfinished. It contains some curious additions from unknown sources, the most interesting being the story of the three wise men and their contest for the palm of wisdom before king Darius, as related in chaps. iii. and iv. Josephus made use of this book to the detriment of his own history. The writer in the extracts given from the canonical book, seems to have made use of the LXX. version, and not of the Hebrew original. The Fourth Book of Esdras or, as it is styled in the English Apocrypha, the Second Book of Esdras, is an apocalyptic production, and has no bearing upon the canonical book.

3. Of the older commentaries on Ezra and Nehemiah, the best are those of Strigel, *Ezra*, 1571, *Nehemiah*, 1575; Clericus, in *Comm. in Libb. Hist.*, 1733; J. H. Michaelis and J. J. Rambach, in *Uberiores Notæ in Hagiogr.*, vol. iii. Of the more modern, are the following: Bertheau, *Ezra, Neh., Esth.*, 1862, and the new work based on Bertheau, but greatly modified by V. Ryssel, 1887; Kamphausen, in *Bunsen's Bibelwerk*, i. Abschn. 3; Keil, 1870; Schulz, *Ezra-Esther*, in *Lange's Bibelwerk*, 1876, English edition with notes by American scholars; Böhme, *Ueber d. Text des Neh.*, 1871; A. F. Kleinert, *Ueber die Entstehung, Bestandtheile, u. das Alter der Bücher Ezr. u. Neh.*, 1832; Nöldeke, *Die alt-test. Litteratur*, 1868; Eb. Schrader, *Die Dauer des zweiten Tempelbaues*, in the *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1867. G. Rawlinson has written on Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, in *Pulpit Commentary*, 1880; and in *Speaker's Commentary*. Smend, *Die Listen der Bücher*

Ezra und Nehemiah, 1881; Rabbi Saadiah, *Commentary on Ezra and Nehemiah*, edited by H. J. Matthews, in Semitic series of *Anec. Oxon.*, 1882. S. Oettli in *Strack-Zöckler's Komm.*, 1889. See also J. Halévy, *Cyrus et le retour de l'exile*, in the *Revue des Études Juives*, Paris, 1880. For Sayce, see p. 146.

§ 8. THE BOOK OF ESTHER.

1. The Book of Esther was written to explain the origin of the Feast of Purim (*lots*), and was possibly intended by the writer to be read during that feast (chap. ix. 27). Whatever may be thought of the details of the story, it is impossible that a national feast like that of Purim could have originated in historical times without some adequate cause, such as that described in the book. This difficulty has induced some to maintain that the book was translated from the Persian, and that the feast was the Persian feast Purdian. That view, however, though set forth by J. von Hammer in 1827, and lately revived by Vatke in his *Hist. krit. Einleitung in d. A. T.*, ed. by Preiss, is beset with more difficulties than the ordinary, and has found no real support among critics. The day of Mardoceus (Mordecai) is referred to in 2 Macc. xv. 36. Ahasuerus was evidently Xerxes, though it is more than doubtful whether Esther can be identified with Amastris, the wife of Xerxes, mentioned by Herodotus, who may, however, have been Vashti. The rash temper of Ahasuerus and the Persian customs are correctly delineated in the story. The name of God does not occur in the book, probably because it was designed to be read in the Jewish houses during feasting, and it was deemed more reverential to omit, under such circumstances,

direct mention of the name of God, for which the later Jews preferred to use divers circumlocutions (comp. "against heaven," Luke xv. 18). The book forms one of the five Megilloth, or "rolls." The author's explanations of Persian usages (chap. i. 13, iv. 11, viii. 8) have been often regarded as proofs of its composition at a later era. But this is by no means decisive; for if the book was intended to be read in all the families of the Jews throughout the Persian empire, such explanations would be necessary. When the Feast of Purim was instituted, circular letters must have been sent round to the Jews of the dispersion, and no time could have been better suited for the appearance of the Book of Esther. The overruling power of Providence is the great lesson taught. The fact that the book was introduced into the canon much later is not at variance with the opinion that it was composed in the Persian period.

2. The name of *God* or *Jehovah* does not occur in the Book of Esther. It has been calculated that in the book which contains 167 verses, the Persian king is mentioned nearly 190 times (the name Ahasuerus occurring 29 times). The fact has often been a stumbling-block. The book is omitted in the lists of the canonical Old Testament writings given by Melito. That omission may, however, have been accidental; but some have ascribed it to the cause just alluded to. The book is omitted also from the list given by Gregory of Nazianzen, and some of the Jewish Rabbis sought to exclude it from the canon (see *Excursus II.* to my *Koheleth*). Athanasius looked coldly on the work, ranking it with non-canonical

books (*Epist. Fest.*). Luther also suspected it. An ingenious attempt has been made by Dr. E. W. Bullinger to discover "*The name of Jehovah in the Book of Esther.*" His pamphlet thus entitled was issued in 1889, price 3d. To be had "from the author, Bremgarten, Woking." It is an exegetical curiosity. He asserts that "in the Book of Esther the name of Jehovah is given four times in an acrostic form." To these four "acrostics" Dr. Bullinger adds a fifth, in a later article in the "*Quarterly Record* of the Trinitarian Bible Society" for January, 1890. These "acrostics," according to Bullinger, are not "the mere work of man," but designed by the Holy Spirit! They are discovered in the initials "read backwards" (Esther i. 20) of the words הִיא וְכָל הַנְשִׁים יִתְנוּ ; in ch. v. 4 in the initials "read forward" of הַמֶּלֶךְ וְהַמֶּן הַיּוֹם ; in v. 13 in the final letters of the words לְ ; זה אֲנָנוּ שׂוֹהֵל ; and similarly in the finals (vii. 7) of כִּי כָלְתָה אֶלְיוֹ הַרְשָׁה. The fifth "acrostic" is that of אֲחִיה (Ex. iii. 14) "read backwards as well as forwards," in four out of the five words (vii. 5) of הוֹא וְזַה הוֹא !! These "acrostics" are noted in some MSS. in the Massorah.

The phenomenon thus noted has been observed before. In a volume of the series known as *Bibliotheca Bremensis*, or *Bibliotheca Historico-Philologico-Theologica*, classis quintae Fasc. prim. Amstelodamii, ap. Sam. Schoonwald MDCCXXI. Fasc. sext. MDCCXXII., at pp. 982-989, there is a short but interesting article entitled, Joachimi Christiani Jehring *Observ. de locis quibusdam Pent. et lib. Esth.* In it Jehring mentions that the Jews called such coincidences in *initials* or *finals* by the technical phrases *Rashe Teboth* and *Sophe*

Teboth, and that they were accustomed to show especial respect when verses with such combinations of letters were read in their synagogues. The following is his list of the phenomena in the Pentateuch : Gen. i. 33 with ii. 1 ; xi. 9, xii. 15, xix. 13, xix. 25, xxix. 24, 25, xxxviii. 7, xxxviii. 24, 25, xlivi. 10, xliv. 3, 4 ; Exod. iii. 13, iv. 3, iv. 14, iv. 16, xii. 15, 16, xvi. 7, xvi. 22, xxv. 23, xxvi. 21, 22, xxxvi. 26, 27, xxxvii. 10 ; Lev. iv. 17, 18, v. 9, 10, viii. 15 ; ix. 9 in the initials “read backwards” of **הַמּוֹבֵחַ וְאֶת־הָרִם יִצְקָח**, also in the same verse in connection with the succeeding verse, in the initials “read forward” of **יִסּוּד הַמּוֹבֵחַ : וְאֶת־הַלְּבָב** ; in xiv. 25, 26, xxi. 22 ; Num. i. 51 in the words, **הַמְשִׁיכָן יִקְרָם** **הַלְּיָם וְהַזָּר הַקָּרְבָּן**, and also in same verse in **יּוֹמָת**, v. 11, v. 18, xiii. 30, xiii. 32, xix. 12, xxiv. 13 ; Deut. ix. 19, 20, x. 7, xi. 2, xxiv. 5, xxx. 12, xxxii. 38, 39. Jehring gives at the end of this list the four first cases in Esther. The phenomena, however, might easily be traced throughout the Bible (see 1 Chron. v. 12 ; 1 Kings xviii. 4, etc.).

According to Dr. Bullinger, the reason for concealing the Divine name in Esther was that at the period of which it treats “God’s face was hidden, hence His name was hidden” ! The conclusion is not very dissimilar from the argument which the Jews, according to Jehring, derived from the phenomena in Deut. xxx. 12. The initial letters of the words found there (**מֵי יָעַלְהָ לְנוּ הַשְׁמִימָה**) form **מֵיְלָה**, the common post-Biblical term for *circumcision*. The finals of the same words make **יְהֹוָה**, *Jehovah*. The phrase is correctly translated, “*Who shall ascend (or go up) for us to heaven?*” But the verb might be regarded as

causative, and so by some, ignorant of syntactical rules, the sentence was rendered “*Who shall bring us up into heaven?*” The finals and initials taken together were interpreted as giving the reply to the question, namely, “*Jehovah, i.e. through the circumcision.*”

All such arguments are but “sacred trifling.” Every Hebrew student knows that the three letters (‘, י and נ) employed in the composition of the Sacred Name are the most common letters in use in the language in the formation of pronominal suffixes, in nominal and verbal afformatives, post-positive or pre-positive. Consequently the number of cases in which such “acrostics” must occur in the Hebrew Scriptures is necessarily large; and there is nothing surprising in the fact that ingenuity has been able to discover five such cases in the Book of Esther. It is of little consequence that the Massorah should, according to some MSS., have noted the facts. It is, however, well to caution the unwary against attaching any importance to such “discoveries.”

3. The Book of Esther in the LXX. version exhibits no little free handling of the original text, even in those portions which coincide for the most part with the Hebrew. The LXX. also contains considerable additions to the narrative. Jerome separated those additions in the Latin Vulgate from the other portions of the work, and placed them together at the end of the tenth chapter. In the English Apocrypha the additions are incongruously arranged as a separate book, entitled, “The Rest of the Book of Esther.” The order in which the portions are given in the English Apocrypha is that of the Latin Vulgate.

The additions consist of the following pieces: (1) *The dream of Mordecai*, prophetical of the deliverance of the Jewish people, with an enlarged account of the conspiracy of the eunuchs, briefly recorded in the canonical Esther, ii. 21-23. This portion, which occupies in the English Apocrypha xi. 2-xii. 6, is in the LXX. placed at the opening of the book before chap. i. 1. (2) *The exposition of Mordecai's dream*, which occurs in the LXX. at the close of the work after chap. x. 4, is given in the English Apocrypha as the opening chapter of the separated portion, and entitled "Part of the Tenth Chapter after the Greek." The last verse of this (chap. x. 15 in the Greek, but chap. xi. 1 in the English Apocrypha) contains a curious but vague account of the introduction into Egypt of the letter enjoining the observance of the Feast of Purim. (3) *The decree drawn up by Haman* for the destruction of the Jews. This is inserted in the Greek between Esther iii. 13 and 14, but in the English Apocrypha occupies chap. xiii. 1-7. (4) *The Prayer of Mordecai*, which immediately follows in the English Apocrypha, occupying chap. xiii. 8-18, is given in the Greek after chap. iv. 17. (5) *The Prayer of Esther*, found in the English Apocrypha at chap. xiv. 1-19, follows in the Greek immediately after that of Mordecai, in chap. iv. (6) The fuller account of *Esther's interview with the king*, given in the English Apocrypha at chap. xv., occurs in the Greek in the commencement of chap. v., before chap. v. 3 in the Hebrew. (7) *The edict in favour of the Jews*, which occupies chap. xvi. in the English Apocrypha, occurs in the Greek after chap. viii. 12.

Besides all these, it ought to be noted that many important minor additions occur in the Greek throughout, and others in the Vulgate text of the portions not found in the Hebrew. The English reader will find the latter given in Churton's excellent edition of *The Uncanonical and Apocryphal Scriptures*, 1884. The LXX. insert various names of God in the portions translated from the Hebrew (*e.g.*, ch. vi. 1, 13) as well as in the additions made to the book.

The additions have, as Vatke observes, a thoroughly Alexandrian character. Haman is styled a *Macedonian*, because, in the period to which the “additions” belong, the Macedonians were looked upon as oppressors. Several of the “additions” were known to Josephus.

4. Several of the works of the older commentators on this book, such as that of Clericus, are still of value. Among the moderns may be mentioned Kelle, *Vindiciæ Estheræ*, 1820; Baumgarten, *De fide Estheræ comm. hist.-critica*, 1839; Nickes, *De Estheræ lib.* (2 vols.), Rome, 1856; Bertheau, 1862; Keil, 1870; Schultz, in Lange's *Bibelwerk*, 1876; Paulus Cassel, 1878, full of information and interesting on many accounts. Not a few of his remarks breathe, as has been remarked, the very spirit of the Midrash. The English translation, by A. Bernstein, published by T. and T. Clark, 1888, contains much new matter. J. S. Bloch, *Hellenistische Bestandteile im bibl. Schriftthum; eine kr. Untersuchung*, 1877, 2te Aufl., 1882. *Der histor. Hintergrund und d. Abfassungszeit d. Buches Esther* in Grätz' *Monatssehrift des Judenthums* for 1886. P. de Lagarde, *Purim, ein Beitrag zur Gesch. der Religion*, 1887, is learned, but fanciful. A. H. Sayce's *Introd. to the Books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther*, 1885, and B. Jacob's *Das Buch Esther bei dem LXX.* in the *Zeitschrift für A. T. Wissenschaft*, 1890, are important.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE POETICAL BOOKS.

§ 1. THE Book of JOB.

1. **M**ANY of the assertions made concerning Job are based on pure conjecture. The name Job (**יְהוֹבָא**) is wholly unconnected with the name **יֹבֵא**, written also *Job* in the Authorised Version, which occurs in Gen. xlvi. 13. In the Revised Version that name is, to avoid misconception, written *Iob*. The name *Job* is of course equally out of connection with *Jobab* (**יּוֹבָב**), found in Gen. xxxvi. 33. The LXX. has, however, incorrectly identified it with the latter in the addition made in that Version to the book at the close of chap. xlvi. The earliest passages of the Old Testament in which the patriarch *Job* is alluded to as a historical person are: Ezek. xiv. 14, 16, 20. The book is quoted by Jeremiah. Compare Jer. xx. 14 ff. with *Job*. iii. A close connection exists between Ps. viii. 5 and *Job* vii. 17 ff.; Ps. lxxii. and *Job* xxix.; Prov. xvi. 15 and *Job* xxix. 23 ff.; Hos. ii. 8 and *Job*. xix. 8; Isa. xix. 5 and *Job* xiv. 11. The connection is more apparent in the Hebrew original, and it is not easy to decide in all these cases which is the earlier passage. There are also many other quotations from, or imitations of, *Job* in other books of the Old Testament.

The patriarch Job is depicted in the book as one who lived in the early patriarchal period. But that fact is not sufficient to prove the poem to have been as early as Moses, as the older commentators maintained. The historical references in the poem are uncertain, for the author has shown much skill in concealing his personal surroundings. The reference in chap. xii. 14-25 to the deportation of people from one country to another tends to prove that the book is later than the Assyrian empire, although some distinguished critics have assigned it to the Solomonic period of Hebrew literature. The most probable time for its composition is between Isaiah and Jeremiah. The theory that suffering Job is an allegory of suffering Israel must be set aside as unsatisfactory. For the sufferings of Job are represented in the poem not as brought upon him by reason of sin ; while the sufferings which befel Israel are represented throughout the Old Testament as the consequences of transgression. Although the poet represents Job as living in the Hauran, he occasionally reveals his own Israelitish standpoint. God is spoken of in the prologue as Jehovah, although that name seems to have been purposely avoided in the dialogue. Job, however, uses the name on two occasions, chap. i. 21, xii. 9. The writer was well acquainted with life in Eastern Palestine, and had an intimate knowledge of the natural history of Egypt. He lived at a period when his readers were sufficiently acquainted with the Egyptian animals to comprehend the glowing descriptions given in the book of the crocodile and the hippopotamus.

2. The subject of the book is the problem of the

sufferings of the righteous. Misfortunes are sometimes the result of sin, and proceed from the punitive hand of the Almighty. But the ungodly are, however, often in great prosperity, while the righteous suffer adversity. Afflictions in the latter case are sometimes (though man may not know it) simply probative, and designed to test and exhibit the character of the pious. This, according to the Prologue, was the unknown cause of the sorrows that overwhelmed Job.

The book opens with a prologue (chap. i.-ii.), which describes Job's righteousness and prosperity, and the ruin which befel him by reason of the hostility of Satan, "the adversary." Job's trust in God even in adversity is strikingly described. But the severest trial occurred when in that adversity he was visited by consoling friends. Job's complaint (chap. iii.) afforded his friends an opportunity of pointing out to him that sin was the real cause of his sufferings. In three sets of speeches (chap. iv.-xxvi.) the friends urged that point, gradually increasing in bitterness of language caused by the obstinacy of Job. For notwithstanding the repeated attacks of his friends, Job stoutly upheld his righteousness, and when hard pressed, ventured even to call in question the righteousness of God Himself. In Job's closing speech, however, the patriarch simply asserted the incomprehensibility of God's ways. Job's closing soliloquy occupies chap. xxvi.-xxxii. A new speaker (Elihu) is then introduced in the person of a bystander, in chap. xxxii., preceded by a short introduction (xxxii. 1-5). Elihu's speech, which advocates the disciplinary and purgative view

of affliction, occupies chap. xxxii. 6 to xxxvii. No reply is given in the book to the speech of Elihu, and Elihu is not even alluded to in the closing chapter, in which all the other speakers are mentioned by name. The speech of Jehovah out of the whirlwind occupies chap. xxxviii.-xli. That speech did not explain the enigma of Job's sufferings; it simply demonstrated the ignorance of man, who is unable to unravel the common secrets of nature which surround him on every side. The conclusion, suggested but not expressed, is, if mortal man be so ignorant of common matters, he cannot expect to understand the secrets of the Most High. The voice of the Almighty out of the storm-cloud was enough for Job. He did not require the moral of that speech to be pointed out to him, but forthwith acknowledged his ignorance and sin (chap. xl. 1-6). Though previously defiant, Job became at once subdued and humble. The book closes with an epilogue (chap. xl. 7-17) which narrates how the friends of Job were condemned for their want of integrity, and how Job himself was restored again to prosperity.

3. The book suggests many critical questions. The prologue and epilogue, though portions often disputed, are essential to the work. Without their assistance the riddle of the book could not be solved. Although comparatively little attention has been called to the fact, it is worthy of note that Job is nowhere described as made acquainted, either before or after his sufferings, with the real cause of his trials. To him all those sufferings seemed to have a purely earthly origin. The genuineness of several portions of the book has been disputed. The objections against the genuineness

of chap. xxvii. 7-xxviii. 28, adduced by Kennicott, Eichhorn, Ewald and others, have, perhaps, finally been set at rest by Giesebricht, *Der Wendepunkt des B. Hiob., Kap. xxvii. und xxviii.*, 1879. The descriptions of behemoth, or the hippopotamus, and of leviathan, or the crocodile (chap. xl. 15 to xli.), have been regarded by some critics as doubtful, because those portions might be omitted without detriment to the poem. More serious are the difficulties which beset the episode of Elihu (chap. xxxii.-xxxvii.), which appears to be an addition by some later hand. The style in which the speeches of Elihu are composed is inferior to that of the other portions of the book. But although those chapters may be later additions, they are by no means an unimportant part of the book. They contain passages of undoubted beauty (chap. xxxiii. 13-30), and, from an ethical standpoint, form a most useful and important appendix to the great work.

4. The Book of Job has called forth at all times a host of commentators. Of the older, Fred. Spanhemii, *Historia Iobi sive de obscuris hist. comm.*, 1672, must not be forgotten, as well as Drusii, *Nova versio et schol.*, 1636; J. H. Michaelis in *Annot. in Hagiogr.*; Alb. Schultens, *Liber Iobi cum nova vers. and comm.*, 2 vols, 4to, 1737. Rosenmüller, *Scholia*, 2nd edit. 1824; *Compend.* 1832. H. Ewald, *Kommentar*, 1836, 2 Aufl., 1851; and in his *Dichter des Alt. Bundes*, 2te Ausg., 1854. An English translation was published by Williams and Norgate, 1882; Heiligstedt, *Comm. gramm. hist. crit.*, in 4th vol. of *Maurer*, 1847; Schlottmann, 1851; Hirzel in *Kurzgef. Ex. Handb.*, 1839, 2te Aufl. by Olshausen, 1851; *neu bearbeitet von Dillmann*, 1869; A. B. Davidson, *Comm. gram. and exeg.*, vol. 1 (chap. i.-xiii.), 1862. The second volume was never published. Also his *Book of Job with notes*, in Cambridge Bible, 1884.

Bernard's *Book of Job expounded to his Cambridge pupils*, edit. by Chance, 1864, is replete with arbitrary interpretations, and must be used with special caution; Ernest Renan, *Le livre de Job traduit de l'Hebreu. Etude sur l'age et le caractère du poème*. 3rd edit., 1865. E. W. Hengstenberg, *Das Buch Hiob erläutert*, 1870, 1875. Ad. Merx, *Das Gedicht von Hiob, Heb. text, kr. bearb. u. übers. nebst Einl.*, 1871. Hitzig, *Comm.*, 1874. Franz Delitzsch, *Comm.*, 1864, 2te Aufl., 1876; English translation published by T. and T. Clark. C. Budde, *Beiträge zur Krit. des B. Hiob*, 1876. Giesebrécht, see above, p. 151. S. Cox, *Commentary with translation*, 1880. G. L. Studer, *Das Buch Hiob übers. u. krit. erläutert*, 1881. G. Bateson Wright, *The Book of Job. A new crit. rev. transl. into English*, 1883. G. G. Bradley, *Lectures on Job*, 1887. E. Reuss, *Hiob*, 1888. Saadiah, *Das Buch Hiob übersetzt u. erklärt*, von J. Cohn, Altona, 1889. W. Volck in *Die Poet. Hagiographa*, vol. vii. of *Strack-Zöckler's Kommentar*, 1889. The Commentary of Prof. S. Lee, Lond., 1837, ought not to be forgotten.

Monographs on passages of Job abound, especially on chap. xix. 25-27, by Kosegarten, 1815; Stickel, 1832; H. Ewald, in *Zeller's Theol. Jahrb.*, 1843; Köstlin, 1846; F. König, 1855; Hoelemann, in his *Bibelstudien*, 1859; S. Oettli, *Hiob und Faust*, 1888; Graf von Baudissin, *Transl. Antiq. Arab. Libri Iobi quæ supersunt nunc prim. edita*, 1870; K. Budde, on Job xxvii., xxviii., in *Zeitschrift für A. T. Wissenschaft*, 1882. A general view of the book is given in C. H. H. Wright's *Biblical Essays*, 1886; as also in A. W. Momerie's *Defects of Modern Christianity and other Sermons*, 1883, a considerable part of which is devoted to an analysis of Job; T. K. Cheyne's *Job and Solomon, or the Wisdom of the Old Testament*, 1887, discusses Job, Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, etc. See *Appendix*.

§ 2. THE PSALMS.

1. The Psalter is in Hebrew termed בְּבִרְכוֹת תְּהִלִּים, *Book of Praises* or *Hymns*. The name is not altogether suitable, for the majority of the poems in the book are rather *prayers*, תפִקְדּוֹת, than *praises*. Moreover

some of them were specially designed as hymns intended to be accompanied by the harp, for which בָּשְׂרַב is the more appropriate expression, from whence the Greek ψαλμοί, from ψάλλειν, and ψαλτήριον, denoting primarily the instrument, and then the collection of psalms. In Luke xx. 42 the expression is used, βίβλος ψαλμῶν.

2. The Psalter was in Hebrew divided into five books (duly given in the Revised Version) in order to correspond with the five several books of the Pentateuch (see pp. 73, 74). The first book includes Ps. i.-xli., all Psalms traditionally supposed to be Davidic or Solomonic. Ps. i. is introductory, and has no superscription. Ps. ii. is also without a title, as well as Ps. x. The latter was probably the conclusion of Ps. ix., with which it is united in the LXX. Ps. xxxiii. has no heading in the Hebrew; but in the LXX. it is ascribed to David. The Psalms contained in the First Book generally employ *Jehovah* as the name of the Divine Being. II. The Second Book is composed of Ps. xlii.-lxxii., and is a collection of Elohistic Psalms, *i.e.* Psalms in which *Elohim* (*God*) is mainly used as the Divine appellation. Of these, Ps. xlii.-xlii. were composed by “the sons of Korah.” Ps. xliii. has no superscription, and was, no doubt, originally a part of the preceding psalm. To the Korahite collection a single psalm of Asaph is appended (Ps. l.), after which follow a number of Elohistic Psalms, generally ascribed to David (Ps. li.-lxvi.). Pss. lxvi. and lxvii. have not the name David in their superscriptions, although the LXX. inserts the name of David in the latter (lxvii.). The collec-

tion of Book II. closes with a Solomonic Psalm (Ps. lxxii.). Two Psalms which are found in the First Book in a Jehovistic form (Ps. xiv. and Ps. xl. 13-17) reappear in the Second Book in an Elohistic form (Ps. liii. and Ps. lxx.). III. The Third Book contains Pss. lxxiii.-lxxxix. inclusive. Of these seventeen Psalms, the first eleven are ascribed to Asaph; four to the sons of Korah (Pss. lxxxiv., lxxxv., lxxxvii., lxxxviii.), the last (Ps. lxxxviii.) being ascribed especially to Heman. Another (Ps. lxxxvi.) is ascribed to David, and one to Ethan (Ps. lxxxix.). The collection of Psalms contained in the Third Book must, on account of Pss. lxxiv. and lxxix., have been made subsequently to the Exile. IV. The Fourth Book of the Psalms comprises also seventeen Psalms (Pss. xc.-cvi.). Most of these are by anonymous writers. The Hebrew superscriptions assign Ps. xc. to Moses, and Ps. ci.-ciii. to David. But the LXX. ascribe eleven of the Psalms contained in this Book to David, leaving only five anonymous Psalms (xcii., c., cii., cv., cvii.). V. The Fifth Book comprehends the remaining Psalms from Ps. cvii. to the end of the Psalter. Fifteen of these Psalms are ascribed in the Hebrew to David, including four of the Psalms known as "Songs of Ascents" (Pss. cxxii., cxxiv., cxxxii., cxxxiii.). Ps. cxxvii. is ascribed to Solomon. In the LXX. and Vulgate the four mentioned "Songs of Ascents" are not assigned to David. All the other Psalms in the book marked as Davidic in the superscriptions are ascribed to the same source by the LXX. and Vulgate. One of these (Ps. cxxxviii.) is in the LXX. ascribed to Haggai and Zechariah. Ps. cxxxvii. is similarly

ascribed in the LXX. to David and Jeremiah; and Pss. cxlvii., cxlviii. (which latter is divided into two Psalms in the LXX.) with Ps. cxlviii. are likewise assigned to Haggai and Zechariah. Similarly in the Syriac (Peshitto Version) several Psalms belonging to the book are said to refer to the prophets of the Restoration, or to their contemporaries, Zerubbabel, Joshua the high priest, and Nehemiah. The Vulgate agrees with the LXX. in making Haggai and Zechariah the authors of Ps. cxlvii. The Vulgate considers Ps. cxi. to refer to the Restoration which took place under those prophets.

The division into five books was made with the object of assimilating the Psalter to the Pentateuch (see pp. 73, 74). An attempt seems to have been made to compare also the number of the verses found in the Psalter and Pentateuch. Geiger mentions a *Baraitha*, or authoritative tradition, in which the number of the verses in the Pentateuch, the Psalter and Chronicles, were made nearly to coincide, the numbers being put respectively at 5,888, 5,881, and 5,889. The verse division of the Massoretes for the three books amounts respectively to 5,845, 2,527, and 1,656.

It is evident that those who arranged the Psalter in its present form wished each of the five books to close with a doxology. This explains the reason why the Fourth Book was made to close with Ps. cvi., and the Fifth Book to open with Ps. cvii., although the latter Psalm is closely connected by the nature of its contents with the two Psalms which immediately precede it. A special formal doxology was

not considered to be required at the close of the Fifth Book, inasmuch as that book closes as it were with "pillars of smoke" of the incense of thanksgiving. The doxology at the close of Book IV. (Ps. cvi. 48) seems, from a comparison of the parallel passage in 1 Chron. xvi. 36, to end with a rubrical direction for the employment of that Psalm in public worship.

3. The number of Psalms contained in the Psalter has been variously estimated. The printed Hebrew text has 150. The LXX. have the same total, although they unite certain Psalms (Ps. ix. with x. and cxiv. with cxv.), and divide others into two (Ps. cxvi. and Ps. cxlvii.), so that the numbering of the Psalms does not correspond. An additional Psalm is added at the end in the LXX., expressly marked as "outside the number." In the Jerusalem Talmud the number assigned to the Psalms is 147, "corresponding to the years of our father Jacob" (*Shabb.* xvi. 1). That number was obtained by combining together certain Psalms, and in old MSS. the number of the Psalms is often less than 150, Ps. xlivi. being combined with Ps. xlii., etc.

4. Allusion has already been made to the superscriptions. In the Hebrew only thirty-four Psalms are without such titles. The titles in some cases mark the liturgical character of special Psalms, *e.g.* "For the chief musician," or "precentor," etc., or their musical character, as *Maskil*, *Shiggaion*, etc. The titles in other cases occasionally specify the instruments of music by which the Psalms were intended to be accompanied, and the measure and melody to be employed. In other cases they specify

the occasions on which the Psalms were employed, e.g. "songs of degrees," or "ascents," probably designed for the pilgrims going up to Jerusalem. The superscriptions also indicate the contents of the Psalms themselves, whether songs of praise or of prayer. In many cases several of these objects are combined in the titles. Still oftener the titles state the supposed authors of the Psalms, and occasionally the occasions on which they were written. Seventy-three Psalms are ascribed to David, thirty-seven of which are found in the First Book.

5. Modern critics do not generally coincide with the statements put forth in the titles (whether of the Hebrew or LXX. Psalter) as to the authorship of the Psalms. Some of these critics take an extreme view, and assert (as Reuss and Kuenen) that no Davidic Psalm is to be found in the Psalter. Ewald admitted only the Davidic authorship of eleven, Hitzig of fourteen. According to Delitzsch, forty-four out of the seventy-three are Davidic. Other critics (as Hitzig, Olshausen, Reuss, etc.) maintain that many of the Psalms are of the Maccabean era; but such extreme views are not generally entertained. Some of the Psalms are undoubtedly post-exilian; a few, such as Pss. xliv., lxxiv., lxxxiii., may be Maccabean, but the latter point is doubtful. The number of Messianic Psalms has been much exaggerated by the older commentators, and has been unduly lessened by the later critics. The most important Messianic Psalms are the ii., xvi., xxii., lxxii., and cx. The New Testament writers recognize decided Messianic elements in Pss. viii., xl., xlv., lxviii., lxix., lxxxix., xci.,

and cxviii. The Messiah is often identified with His people, and what refers to them refers to Him also. Moreover, prophecies which primarily refer to the Messiah are often applicable to all the people of God. The seven Psalms known ecclesiastically as the seven Penitential Psalms, are the vi., xxxii., xxxviii., li., cii., cxxx., and cxliii. The theology of the Psalter is the same as that of the prophets; and as the Psalms were used in the congregation as well as in private devotion, they present us with a vivid picture of the theology which prevailed among the pious portion of the people of Israel.

6. The Targum on the Psalms must on the whole be regarded as the oldest commentary on the book. That Targum, however, is in its present shape younger than the Syriac Peschitto Version. This question has been discussed by Nöldeke, and later by Friedr. Baethgen in his *Untersuchungen über die Psalmen nach der Peschitto*, 1878, and in his articles on *Der textkr. Wert der alten Uebers. z. d. Ps.* in the *Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.*, 1882. Several of the Fathers wrote on the Psalms, as Hilary, Chrysostom, and Augustine; and Jewish commentaries of great value are those of Rashi, Ibn Ezra, and D. Kimchi. Dr. Schiller-Szinessy has edited a portion of the latter (Book I.) at the Cambridge Press. Numerous are the writers on the Psalms during the Reformation era, such as Luther, Calvin, whose commentary, newly edited by Tholuck in 1836, has not lost its value; Aretius Felinus (M. Butzer), 1526; E. Rüdinger, 1580. The notes of Fr. Vatablé, of Paris, are to be found in R. Stephanus, *Bibl.*, 1557, and in the *Critici Sacri*, which contain also many notes of value from other commentaries. In post-reformation times appeared the commentaries of Mart. Geier, 1668, 2 vols., 4to, folio 1709; J. H. Michaelis, *Adn. phil.-exeget. in Hagiov.*, 1720; H. Venema, 6 vols., 1762-1767; C. A. Crusius, *Hypomne-*

mata, 1764-1778 ; Rosenmüller, *Scholia*, 3 vols., 1798, 2nd ed., 1821. The modern school may be said to commence with de Wette's *Commentary*, 1811, 5th edit. by G. Baur, 1856; Stier, 1834-1836 ; F. Hitzig, 1835, 1836, new edition 1863-5 ; E. W. Hengstenberg, 1842-7, 2te Aufl., 1849-52, translated into English, T. and T. Clark ; H. Ewald, 1835, *Dichter des alten Bundes*, I., neue Ausarb., 1866, English translation by Johnston, 1881, *krit. Comm.*, 1882 ; H. Hupfeld, 1855-62, 2te Ausg. by Riehm., 3te Ausg. by Nowack, 1888 ; A. Tholuck, practical, 2te Aufl., 1873 ; J. Olshausen, 1853 ; E. Boehl, *Zwölf Mess-Psalmen*, 1862 ; Franz Delitzsch, 1859, 4te Aufl., 1883, 1884, translated into English and specially revised by the author (3 vols.), Hodder and Stoughton, 1887-1890 ; J. J. S. Perowne, *The Book of Psalms*, 2 vols., 7th edit., 1890 ; A. C. Jennings and W. H. Lowe, *The Psalms with critical notes*, 2nd edit., 1884-5 ; T. K. Cheyne, *Book of Psalms*, transl., 1884 ; *Comm.*, 1888 ; *Origin and Religious Ideas of the Psalter* (Bampton Lectures), 1891 ; John Forbes (Prof. at Aberdeen), *The Book of Psalms*, and his *Studies in the Book of Psalms*, 1888 ; Graetz, *Krit. Comm.*, 1882 ; Ed. Reuss, *Poésie lyrique*, 1879 ; Hirsch, *Die Ps. übersetz. u. erkl.*, 1882 ; F. W. Schultz, in Strack and Zöckler's *Comm.*, 1888.

The monographs written upon special Psalms, or on subjects connected with the book, are too numerous to be mentioned here ; but it may be well to note that Giesebrécht has written on Book II.-V. in the *Zeitschrift für A. T. W.* for 1881 ; Carl Ehrt, *Abfassungszeit u. Abschluss des Psalters (über Macca-bäerpsalmen) hist. krit. untersucht*, 1869 ; T. K. Abbott on the *Alphabetical Arrangement of the Ninth and Tenth Psalms*, in *Hermathena*, Dublin, 1889. Baethgen's articles on the Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia in the *Zeitschrift für A. T. W.* for 1885, 1886, and 1887 are of special interest. So also the article of R. Smend in *Studien und Kritiken* for 1888, Bishop Alexander (of Derry), Bampton Lectures on the *Witness of the Psalms to Christ and Christianity*, 3rd edit., revised, 1890; Böttcher's notes in *Aehrenlese z. A. T.*, ii. 1864, are important; and on Ps. lxviii. in his *Proben A. T. Schrifterklärung*, 1833. In the *Studio Biblica*, vol. ii., Clar. Press, Oxford, 1890, Ad.

Neubauer has written on *The Authorship and the Titles of the Psalms according to early Jewish Authorities*.

Numerous works have been published on the form of Hebrew poetry. Among these may be noted Bishop Lowth's *De sacra poesi ebr.*, often re-edited, as by Michaelis, 1777; by Rosenmüller, 1815; and even translated into English. Ewald, Hupfeld, and other scholars have written on the same subject. Among the latest writers are E. Meier, 1853; H. Steiner, *Ueber hebr. Poesie*, 1873; G. Bickell, *Carm. V.T. metrice*, 1882, etc.

§ 3. THE BOOK OF PROVERBS.

1. The Book of Proverbs bears the superscription (Prov. i. 1) of "The Proverbs (**מִשְׁלֵי**) of Solomon, son of David, king of Israel." The word **מִשְׁלֵי** signifies a *representation* or *similitude*, and is not properly translated as in the LXX. by *παροιμίαι* Σαλωμῶνος or in the Vulgate, *Proverbia Salomonis*. Though, however, properly "similitudes," the word is also in this book applied to sententious sentences.

I. The book opens with what may be described as a preface setting forth the general character of its contents (chap. i. 1-7). II. This preface is succeeded by a number of introductory discourses in praise of wisdom, specially designed for young men (chap. i. 8-ix. inclusive), the whole series forming a poem of great merit. III. This is succeeded by a collection of sentences, bearing the superscription of "The proverbs of Solomon," **מִשְׁלֵי שְׁלֹמֹה** (chap. x. 1). This portion, which includes chap. x. 1-xxii. 16, has been subdivided by Ewald into five parts, beginning respectively chap. x. 1, xiii. 1, xv. 20, xvii. 25, xix. 20. The proverbs in this collection appear to be the oldest in form, and consist for the most part of two contrasted

sentences. IV. A new section, though without a formal superscription, begins at chap. xxii. 17, with the words, “ Incline thine ear, and hear the words of the wise,” *זָבְןִי תְּקַנִּים*. That short section is a kind of appendix to the preceding, and closes at chap. xxiv. 22. V. It is followed by another appendix, which is preceded by the formula : “ These are also (sayings) of the wise,” or literally, “ Even these (belong) to the wise,” *גַם־אֵלֶּה לְחַכְמִים*. This supplementary appendix embraces chap. xxiv. 23-34. Each of these two appendices contain a striking parabolic poem. That which is found in the former describes the evil effects of wine and drunkenness (chap. xxiii. 29-35) : that which occurs in the latter paints a vivid picture of the sluggard and the results of his slothfulness (chap. xxiv. 30-34). VI. The next portion of the book, consisting of chap. xxv.-xxix., contains another collection of the proverbs of Solomon, beginning with the formula, *גַם אֵלֶּה מִשְׁלֵי שְׁלֹמֹה*, “These also are proverbs of Solomon which the men of Hezekiah copied out” (chap. xxv. 1). “The men of Hezekiah” were probably a college of scribes, organized by that monarch for the purpose of the preservation and editing of the sacred writings of the nation. The college probably existed under that name for a long time subsequent to Hezekiah’s reign. This portion of the book is rich in emblematic sentences containing three, four or five lines each, and also includes a parabolic poem (chap. xxvii. 23-27). These collections of the Proverbs of Solomon, and of the sayings of the wise, are followed by three remarkable appendices which conclude the work. VII. The first

of these (chap. xxx.) contains “the words of Agur the son of Jakeh.” VIII. The second “the words of king Lemuel” (chap. xxxi. 1-9). The word נִגְדָּה, rendered in the prophets “burden,” “oracle,” occurs in both these superscriptions, in the first with the article. Its occurrence creates considerable difficulties, for it may be regarded also as a proper name. Nothing whatever is really known about either Agur or Lemuel, but numerous conjectures have been made which cannot here be summarised. IX. The last chapter of the book (chap. xxx. 10-31) also contains a didactic poem of great beauty, in praise of a good wife. Each of the twenty-two verses commences in due order with a letter of the Hebrew alphabet, and the poem has been well termed “a golden alphabet.”

2. There are no decisive reasons to compel us to call in question the Solomonic authorship of the collection of proverbs ascribed to him. The whole book was in ancient times regarded as the work of Solomon. The phenomena of the book, however, prove it to be of various authorship, although we can see no objection to the view that Solomon wrote the proverbs ascribed to him. It is certainly a groundless assumption that a writer or collector of such proverbs as are contained in the first collection could not have made a second collection of a somewhat different character. It is, however, to be noted that the text of the LXX. contains proverbs not to be found in the Hebrew, and in some places in that version the chapters are arranged in different order. Many repetitions are found in the book; whole proverbs are repeated word for word, or with slight alterations not affecting

the sense, *e.g.* chap. xiv. 12 reappears at chap. xvi. 25 ; chap. xxi. 19 reappears at chap. xxv. 24 ; chap. xviii. 8 in chap. xxvi. 22 ; chap. xxii. 3 in chap. xxvii. 12 ; chap. xx. 16 in chap. xxvii. 13. Other proverbs are repeated with alterations and additions, *e.g.* chap. xvi. 2 in xxi. 2 ; chap. xv. 8 in chap. xxi. 27 ; chap. xi. 13, in chap. xx. 19, etc.

3. Melanchthon wrote a commentary on the Proverbs, 1555, but the Reformation period is not rich in commentaries on the book. Important still is Martin Geier's *Proverbia enucleata*, 1669, 2nd edit., 1725. A. Schultens' commentary, 1748, is massive, but needs to be used with caution ; latest edition by Teller, 1769. Umbreit, *Philol. krit. u. philos. Komm.*, 1826. Rosenmüller, *Scholia*, 1829. Ewald, *Die Salomonischen Schriften*, 2te Ausg., 1867. Bertheau, 1847, newly worked up by Nowack, 1883 ; Elster, 1858 ; Hitzig, 1858 ; Moses Stuart (the American scholar), 1852. Zöckler, in Lange's *Bibelwerk*, 1867 ; translated into English, and edited with additions by Dr. Aiken, in the American edition of that work, T. and T. Clark, 1869. Franz Delitzsch, 1873 ; Rohling, 1879. Ibn Ezra's (?) Commentary on the book has been edited by Prof. Driver, 1880. The *Midrash Mishle* has been translated into German by Aug. Wünsche, in his valuable *Bibliotheca Rabb.*, 1885. Herm. Deutzsch, *Die Sprüche Salomo's nach der Auffassung im Talmud u. Midrasch*, 1885-1886 ; Henri Bois, *La poésie gnomique chez les Hébreux et les Grecs, Solomon et Théognis*, Toulouse, 1886 ; Ant. J. Baumgartner, *Étude critique sur le texte du livre des Proverbes*, Leipzig, 1890 ; H. L. Strack, *Comm.* in *Strack and Zöckler's Comm.*, 1888.

The monograph of H. F. Mühlau, *De prov. quæ dicuntur Aguri et Lemuelis orig. atque indole*, 1869, and Graetz's *Eregetische Studien zu den Salom. Sprüchen*, in his *Monatsschrift für Gesch. u. Wiss. d. Judenthums*, 1884, are both important. T. K. Cheyne in *Job and Solomon* (see p. 152) ; S. C. Malan, *Original Notes on the Book of Proverbs*, vol. 1

(chap. i.-x.), 1890 ; A. Rahlf, *Greg. Abulfarag, genannt Bar Ebhroyo, Anmerkungen, zu den Salomonischen Schriften*, 1887 ; C. G. Montefiore, in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 1890 (July).

§ 4. ECCLESIASTES.

1. The Book of Ecclesiastes, in the Hebrew canon constitutes one of the five Megilloth, and was read at the Feast of Tabernacles. In Hebrew the book is termed *Koheleth* (קָהֶלֶת), which is translated by the LXX. Ἐκκλησιαστής, or the *Preacher*, Latinized in the Vulgate as *Ecclesiastes*, and adopted generally as its title. The meaning of the word has been much disputed. It is probably a feminine form used to intensify the meaning, and several proper names of the same formation occur in the later books as names of men (Neh. vii. 57 ; Ezra ii. 57). In one passage of this book (chap. vii. 27) the word is treated as feminine, but the reading of the Hebrew there is probably erroneous. In all other passages the word is construed as masculine. The writer gives his experience in the person of Solomon, but he does not pretend to be really Solomon. The very mode in which the writer refers to Solomon shows clearly that the author did not wish to impose on his readers. Solomon is spoken of in chap. i. 12-18 as one who had already passed away from the world. The name, consequently, was assumed by the writer not as a “pious fraud,” but as a legitimate literary device, which was made use of also in later times by the author of the Book of Wisdom. The statements made in the epilogue have also been regarded by many as

containing a distinct disavowal of the Solomonic authorship. So also the allusions in the book to complaints of oppression and so forth. The book was, however, regarded in ancient times as the work of Solomon; although there are indications in the Targum, Talmud, and elsewhere, which show that the Jewish wise men were not unanimous on that point. The Solomonic authorship has, however, been defended by critics of mark, though late critical opinion is almost unanimous against it. The language of the work and the circumstances of the times alluded to prove it to have been composed in the last century of the Persian period (B.C. 440-336).

The form of a Solomonic autobiography, which has been assumed by the writer, extends only to the first two chapters. In those chapters the writer demonstrates the vanity of all earthly things, and shows there is no real progress (chap. i. 1-11). He then recounts his personal discovery of the vanity of wisdom (chap. i. 12-18), of the vanity of pleasure and riches (chap. ii. 1-11), for the end of the wise and the fool is alike (chap. ii. 12-17), and riches though gathered by toil are little worth (ii. 18-23). He finally depicts the conditions necessary for cheerfulness (ii. 24-26). In chap. iii. 1-15, he proves that God is the avenger of all things, and man is powerless before Him. He next shows (iii. 16-22) the wickedness of men, compares them to the beasts that perish, and describes the misery caused by oppression (iv. 1-3), rivalry, and toil (iv. 4-6), the advantages of companionship (iv. 7-12), the vanity common to political life (iv. 13-16), and exhibited in religious services (iv. 17-

v. 6). The vanity of riches under various circumstances is pointed out (v. 7-vi. 6). The vanity of desire itself (vi. 7-9), is shown, for man in himself is powerless (vi. 10-12). Chap. vii. 1-24 contains proverbs concerning things that ought to be preferred by the wise, and speaks of the practical advantage of wisdom, even under the uncertain affairs of man. The wicked woman is described in chap. vii. 25-29; the benefit of wisdom in the days of oppression and doubt, trust in God is inculcated (chap. viii. 1-15), the writer again reverting to the thought of human ignorance and powerlessness (chap. viii. 16-ix. 2). Death and Hades are darkly spoken of in chap. ix. 3-12. A little parable proving the utility of wisdom is given without comment in chap. ix. 13-18. Next follow proverbs on the value of wisdom and the results of folly (chap. x. 1-15), and on the misery of a land under a foolish king. Benevolence is shown to be wise, and the duty of enjoying the present is spoken of in chap. xi. 1-8. The writer finally bursts forth into a song which describes "the Days of Life, and the Days of Death" in chap. xi. 9-xii. 7. This poem has been less fitly supposed to be an allegorical poem of "the days of youth and old age." The literal interpretation is, however, preferable. The epilogue at the end of the book (chap. xii. 8-14) is supposed by many critics to have been written by a different author. The supposition is by no means necessary. A day of judgment for every man is the solemn truth with which the Book of Koheleth closes. Dark as is the standpoint from which the book is written, light seems to break forth at its close. The

book recognizes human ignorance more fully than any other work in the sacred canon. But it recognizes also that there is a judgment coming which will finally dissipate the darkness. The book may thus be regarded as a cry for light, suitably stirred up by the Holy Spirit, who ever broods over the chaos of man's ignorance, and designed fitly to precede the New Testament revelation of the Light of the world and the Victor over the grave.

2. The commentary of Jerome on the book is still worthy of notice. Of the more modern commentaries may be mentioned those of Mercer, 1573; Drusius, 1635; M. Geier, 1668; van der Palm, *Eccel. phil. et crit. illust.*, 1784; Zirkel, *Untersuchungen*, 1792; Knobel, 1836; Herzfeld, 1838; Ewald, *Dichter des alt. Bundes*, ii., 1867; A. Heiligstedt, *Comm. gram. hist. crit.*, 1848, in Maurer's *Comm. in V. T.*; Vaihinger, 1858; Hengstenberg, 1859, English translation by D. W. Simon, published by T. and T. Clark, 1860; Franz Delitzsch, 1875; Kleinert, 1864; Zöckler, 1868, English translation with additions by Professor Taylor Lewis, 1872; Graetz, 1871; Nowack, 1883; R. Smend, 1889.

Important English commentaries on the book are those of Theod. Preston, with translation of Mendelssohn's Comm. 1845; C. D. Ginsburg, 1861; S. Cox, *Expository Lectures*, 1867, new edition in *Expositor's Bible*, 1891; T. P. Dale, 1873; Thos. Tyler, 1874; E. H. Plumptre, 1881; C. H. H. Wright, *The Book of Koheleth considered in reference to Modern Crit. and Modern Pessimism, with crit. and gram. comm.*, 1883; T. K. Cheyne, in *Job and Solomon*, 1887; G. G. Bradley, *Lectures on Ecclesiastes*, 1887; Prof. A. W. Momerie's *Agnosticism*, 1884, contains an exposition of Ecclesiastes. See *App.*

Important monographs on the book, or portions thereof, are:—J. S. Bloch, *Ursprung u. Entstehungszeit*, 1872. Ed. Boehl, *De Aramaismis*, 1860. N. J. Linnarson, *De illo cod. sac. libro qui Koheleth inscrib. Quæst.*, Upsala, 1860. D. Johnston, *Treatise on the Authorship of Ecclesiastes*, 1880. and his *Exam. of Dr. Plumptre's Comm. on Eccl.*, 1885. Dr. C.

Taylor, *Dirge of Coheleth*, 1874. Winzer, *Comm. de Koh xi. 9-xii. 7*, 1818, 1819. A. Köhler, *Ueb. d. Grundanschauungen d. B.*, 1885. R. Bidder, *Koheleths Stellung zum Unsterblichkeitsglauben*, 1875. G. Bickell, *Der Prediger über den Wert des Daseins*, 1884. E. Renan, *L'Ecclésiaste traduit de l'H. avec une Étude, etc.*, 1882. Klostermann, *Recension of Wright's Koheleth in Studien u. Kritiken* for 1885. H. Grätz in *Monatsschrift für Judentum*, 1885. E. Kautzsch, in *Ersch und Gruber*, II., Sect. xxxviii. p. 27 ff. A. Palm, *Qoheleth u. die nach-aristotelische Philosophie*, 1885, and *Die Qoheleth Litteratur*, 1886. E. Pfeiderer, *Die Philosophie des Heraklit von Ephesus*, 1886; of this work pp. 255-288 are on Qoheleth. M. Friedländer, *Age and Authorship of Ecclesiastes*, in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 1889. Seb. Euringer (Rom. Cath.), *Des Masora-text des Koheleth kritisch untersucht*, Leipzig, 1890.

§ 5. THE SONG OF SONGS.

1. The Song of Songs (שיר הַשִּׁירִים, LXX. ᾧσμα ᾧσμάτων) is now generally admitted to be a single poem proceeding from a single author, and not a collection of several independent poems, as was formerly maintained by some critics. It is dramatic in form, but not designed for the stage, though probably originally intended to be sung in parts. It is a song in which is described the triumph of true and virtuous love over impure and sensual passion. It probably depicts the love of a shepherd towards a maiden betrothed to him, who, tempted by the ladies of the royal court, and by Solomon himself, to join the royal harem, resisted all such temptations, and was finally praised by her brothers for her enduring constancy. The chorus is composed of the daughters of Jerusalem. Solomon himself does not appear in the poem in a

favourable light, but rather as the tempter of the maiden; and the language of the poem (chap. vii. 1-9), with which fault has often been found for its coarseness and indelicacy, is not intended to express the sentiments of true love, but of sensual passion. If the literal meaning be admitted to be that primarily intended, it is easy to see that the language is capable of being interpreted in an allegorical signification, and was probably intended to bear such a secondary meaning. Ps. xlvi. is of itself sufficient to prove how easy is the ascent from the literal sense to a higher and allegorical. It is highly probable, too, that such poems were preserved among the Sacred Writings, mainly because of this very fact, that they were susceptible of such a higher interpretation. The opinion of the older critics, that the Song of Songs describes dialogues between Solomon and an espoused bride (Solomon and Shulamith), is untenable. Shulamith (שׁוּלָמִית) is not the feminine form of Solomon (שׁוּלָם), but is identical with שׁוּנָמִית, a *Shunamite*, or woman of Shunem or Sunem. The word only occurs in chap. vi. 13 (Heb. vii. 1). The LXX. thus rightly explain the word (*ἡ Σουναῖτις*), and their explanation is confirmed by the fact that the old town of Shunem is now called Sulam (Arab. سولم).

The fact that the writer speaks of Tirzah (vi. 4), the royal residence of the kings of Israel before Samaria became the capital, is considered in favour of the early composition of the poem. But it must be observed that Tirzah is only referred to as a beautifully situated city, and not as a capital; and in preference to Jerusalem because the loved one was from Shunem,

which is situated in that direction. The poem cannot have been much later than the Solomonic era. It must be borne in mind that there are scholars of eminence who maintain still, in spite of the general view given above, that the poem does describe a marriage with Solomon of a bride from the northern part of Israel, so that the question cannot be considered yet as finally closed. The whole poem is replete with the fragrance of country life. The poet knew Jerusalem as the capital of the kingdom, but his whole soul was filled with love of the country. Whether the song be regarded as a song of pure love, or as a marriage song composed in an era when polygamy was not distinctly condemned, the poem is in either case of importance from a didactic point of view. The impure influences of city life were even then leading astray many into debasing immorality. Immorality even in the Solomonic period was nourished by the idolatry which was frequently winked at, if not distinctly patronised, by the court party, and too often popular in both Israel and Judah. The Song of Songs does not, however, describe marriage, which is only viewed as something in the future, and it cannot be regarded as a poem in praise of monogamy. The author seems to have belonged to a northern tribe. The various scenes of the poem are marked off from one another by the recurrence of particular phrases at the beginning and end of each scene. But in many details, however, there is room for wide difference of opinion. The higher sense of the poem has been recognized from the earliest times, but it has suffered much from the extravagances of the mystic com-

mentators. The Song of Songs forms one of the five Megilloth, and is read annually at the Feast of the Passover.

2. The Song of Songs is nowhere cited in the New Testament, nor is it quoted by Philo. The allegorical interpretation cannot with certainty be traced back earlier than Origen, although once introduced it has stoutly maintained the field. The Jewish interpreters may have borrowed their ideas on that subject from the Christians. The Targum on the book is post-Talmudical, and the Midrash even later. The latter has been translated into German by Dr. A. Wünsche, in his *Bibl. Rabbinica*. Portions of the work are no doubt susceptible of a spiritual interpretation. The commentary of Bernhard of Clairvaux, edited in German by Fernbacher, with preface by Delitzsch (*Die Reden des heil. Bernhard über das Hohelied*), is a good specimen of this interpretation, as also is Dr. R. F. Littledale's commentary on the book, 1869. Rosenmüller, in his *Scholia*, 1830; Köster, 1839; Hengstenberg, 1853; H. A. Hahn, 1852; Hoelemann, *Die Krone des H. L.*, 1856, are among the most prominent of the German commentators who, in one form or other, have upheld the allegorical interpretation. More critical views have been advanced by J. G. Herder, *Lieder der Liebe*, 1778; F. W. C. Umbreit, *Lied der Liebe*, 2nd edit., 1828; H. Ewald, *Das H. L. Sal.*, 1826; and in his *Dichter des A. B.*, ii., 1867; F. Böttcher, *Die ältesten Buhndichtungen*, 1850; C. D. Ginsburg, *Song of Songs, with hist. and crit. comm.*, 1857; Franz Delitzsch, 2te Ausg., 1875; F. Hitzig, 1855; O. Zöckler, in *Lange's Bibelwerk*, 1868, translated into English, with additions, by American scholars; H. Graetz, 1871; B. Schäfer, 1876; S. J. Kämpf (Jewish), 1877, 2nd edit., 1879; L. Noack, *Tharraqah and Sunamith*, 1869; Dr. Caj. Kossowicz, *Canticum Cant. ex Hebræo convertit et explicavit*, Petropoli, 1879; J. G. Stickel, *Das H. L. in seiner Einheit u. dram. Gliederung*, 1888; C. F. Godet, in his *Études Bibliques*, 1873; Theod. Gessner, *Das Hohelied erkl. und übersetzt*, 1888; F. S. Tiefenthal, *Das Hohelied ausgelegt für Theologiestudirenden*, Kempten, 1889. S. Oettli, in *Strack*

and Zöckler, 1889. Poetical, though somewhat repulsive, is *The Song of Songs: a Hebrew Pastoral Drama, not by king Solomon, with notes and illustrations by Satyam Jayati [a nom de plume, "Truth conquers"]*, Lond., 1867. Ginsburg's view has been prettily popularised in English in *The Song of Solomon rendered into English Verse*, by James Pratt, D.D., 1881.

CHAPTER XV.

THE PROPHETS.

§ 1. ON THE PROPHETS IN GENERAL.

1. ON Prophecy and the Prophets in general consult H. Witsius, *De prophetis et prophetia*, in his *Miscell. Sacra*, 1692. J. Clericus, *Vet. Test. prophetæ*, 1731. Chr. A. Crusius, *Hypomnemata ad theolog. proph. pertinentia*, 1764, 1778. E. W. Hengstenberg, *Christologie des A. T.*, 2nd edit., 1854-1857, English translation published in 4 vols. by T. and T. Clark; English abridged edit. by T. K. Arnold. A. Knobel, *Der Prophetismus d. Hebräer*, 2 parts, 1837. J. J. Stähelin, *Die Messian. Weissagungen des A. T.*, 1847. F. M. Köster, *Die Proph. des A. u. N. T. nach ihrem Wesen u. Wirken*, 1838. Redslob, *Der Begriff der Nabi*, 1839. J. C. K. v. Hofmann, *Weissagung u. Erfüllung*, 2 parts, 1841, 1844. Davison, *On Prophecy*, 1839. Franz Delitzsch, *Die bibl. proph. Theologie, ihre Fortbildung durch Crusius, u. ihre neueste Entwicklung seit Hengstenberg*, 1845; id. *Messianic Prophecies*, translated by S. I. Curtiss, 1880; new edit. now in the press, T. and T. Clark. A. Tholuck, *Die Propheten u. ihre Weissagungen*. 2te Aufl. 1860. L. Reinke (Roman Catholic), *Die Mess. Weissagungen bei den gross. u. kl. Proph. des A. T.*, 5 vols., 1859-62. G. F. Oehler, *Ueb. d. Verhältn. d. A. T. Proph. z. heidn. Mantik*, 1861: id. *Theol. des A. T.*, 1873, 2te Aufl., 1882, English translation published by T. and T. Clark. G. Bauer, *Gesch. d. A. T. Weissagung*, 1861. H. Ewald, *Die Propheten d. A. B.*, 3 vols., 2te Aufl., 1867, 1868, English translation published in Williams and Norgate's *Theological Translation Fund*. Küper, *Das Proph. d. A. B.*, 1870. B.

Duhm, *Die Theologie der Proph.*, 1875. R. Payne Smith, *Bampton Lectures on Prophecy a Preparation for Christ*, 1869. Kuenen, *De Profeten en de Profetie onder Israel*, 1875, English translation, *The Prophets and Prophecy in Israel*, 1877. Ed. Reuss, *Les Prophètes*, 2 vols., 1876, in his *La Bible, Traduction nouvelle avec introd. et comm.* S. Leathes, *Old Testament Prophecy, its Witness*, 1880. H. Schultz, *A. T. Theologie*, 2te Aufl., 1878. F. Hitzig, *Bibl. Theologie des A. T. u. Messianische Weissagungen*, herausgeg. von Kneucker, 1880. C. J. Bredenkamp, *Gesetz u. Propheten*, 1881. F. E. König, *Der Offenbarungsbegriff d. A. T.*, 2 vols., 1882. C. v. Orelli, *Die A. T. Weissagung v. d. Vollendung des Gottesreiches*, 1882, English translation published by T. and T. Clark. E. Böhl, *Christologie d. A. T.*, 1882. E. Riehm, *Die Mess. Weissagung*, 2te Aufl., 1885, English transl. 1876, new transl. by L. A. Muirhead, 1891; T. and T. Clark. W. Robertson Smith, *The Prophets of Israel and their Place in History*, 1882. Brownlow Maitland, *The Argument from Prophecy*, 1877. Important are C. Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy*, 1886; Delitzsch, *Messianic Prop. in hist. succession*, 1891.

2. Among general commentaries may be mentioned: Rosenmüller's *Scholia*, which are always useful; Jesaia, 3rd edit., 1829-1834; Jeremiah and Lamentations, 1826, 1827; Ezekiel, 2nd edit., 1820, 1826; Daniel, 1832; Proph. Minores, 2nd edit., 1827, 1828. *The Translation of the Prophets from Isaiah to Malachi*, with Notes by Lowth, Blayney, Newcome, Wintle, and Horsley, 5 vols., 1836, is antiquated, but occasionally useful for English scholars. Rowland Williams, *Hebrew Prophets Translated*; vol. i. *Prophets during Assyrian Empire*, 1866; vol. ii. *Babylon and Persia*, 1871 (left unfinished by the author). Henderson, *Comm. on Isaiah*, 1857; *Ezekiel*, 1855; *The Minor Prophets*, 1858.

The writers in Lange's *Bibelwerk*, the *Speaker's Commentary*, the *Pulpit Commentary*, and in Keil and Delitzsch *Comm.*, and in the *Kurzgef. Exeg. Handb.* will be found mentioned under the several books.

A.—THE FOUR GREATER PROPHETS.

§ 2. ISAIAH.

1. Isaiah—*ישׁעַת יְהָוָה*, *The Salvation of Jahveh*, Gr. Ἰσαῖας, Latin *Isaias* and *Esaias*—was the greatest of the Hebrew prophets. His father's name was Amoz (עִזּוֹז), which name must not be confounded with that of the prophet Amos (עָמוֹץ), as was done by many of the Greek and Latin writers. Of Amoz nothing is really known, although a Jewish tradition of very little authority makes Amoz a brother of king Amaziah. According to the superscription of Isa. i. 1, compared with chap. vi. 1, Isaiah prophesied during the reigns of four kings; and if twenty years of age when he began his prophetic ministry in the reign of Uzziah, must have been considerably above eighty when he died. He died a martyr's death in the beginning of Manasseh's reign, according to a Jewish tradition, probably referred to in Heb. xi. 37. Isaiah was married, and his wife is termed a “prophetess” (chap. viii. 3). He had at least two sons, Shear-jashub (chap. vii. 3) and Maher-shalal-hash-baz (chap. viii. 3).

2. The Book of Isaiah consists of two main portions, the former of which embraces chap. i.-xxxix.; the second, chap. xl.-lxvi. The first half mainly consists of prophecies arising out of circumstances which took place in the reigns of Ahaz and Hezekiah. The second portion is occupied chiefly with the Babylonian captivity and the restoration from exile.

I. The first part is subdivided into several sections.
 (a) *Prefatory*. The sixth chapter relates the call of the prophet. Chap. i.-v. inclusive contain prophecies

later in point of time, but which were placed in their present position as being peculiarly suitable as a general preface. (b) Chap. vii.-xii. have been well termed “the book of Immanuel,” and contain prophecies designed to comfort the pious under the Assyrian troubles. The land, though overwhelmed by the foe, belonged to “Immanuel” (chap. viii. 8), and therefore would be ultimately delivered. (c) Chap. xiii.-xxiii. are composed of prophecies directed against various nations. Of these, chap. xiii.-xiv. 23 contains prophecies against Babylon; chap. xiv. 24-27 against Assyria; chap. xiv. 28-32 against Philistia; chap. xv.-xvi. against Moab; chap. xvii. against Syria and its capital Damascus; chap. xviii. refers to Ethiopia; chap. xix., xx. speak of Egypt; chap. xxi. contains short predictions respecting Babylon, Edom, and Arabia; chap. xxii. utters a prophecy of woe against Jerusalem, which closes with a bitter denunciation of Shebna, who was treasurer during part of Hezekiah’s reign. In that prophecy is contained a prediction of the exaltation to office of Eliakim, who, notwithstanding his personal integrity, was warned beforehand that his own downfall should in turn be caused by a fatal tendency to nepotism. These closing verses are considered by some critics to have been inserted in this place out of order. The suggestion is open to serious doubt. Chap. xxiii., which closes this section of the book, contains a remarkable prediction against Tyre. (d) Chap. xxiv.-xxvii. are of a distinctly apocalyptic character, and give a vivid description of the final overthrow of the world-power. Babylon, Assyria,

and Egypt are the nations which are here specially present to the prophet's mind. (e) "The Book of Woes" is a suitable description of chap. xxviii.-xxxiii. Those prophecies were directed against Samaria and Judah, and describe the Assyrian invasion under Sennacherib, and the great deliverance then vouchsafed to Israel. (f) Chap. xxxiv. and xxxv. are also apocalyptic in tone. In those chapters Edom figures as the representative of the enemies of Zion. (g) Chap. xxxvi.-xxxix. form an historical appendix to the whole work, and are almost identical with 2 Kings xviii. 13, 17-37, xix., xx., with the exception of the psalm of Hezekiah, which is not found in the Book of Kings.

There is much difference of opinion among critics on the question of the authorship by Isaiah of the prophecies relative to Babylon in chap. xiii.-xiv., xxi., and of the two series of apocalyptic chapters (viz. chap. xxiv.-xxvii., and xxxiv.-xxxv.). The difficulties in the case of chap. xxi. are generally supposed to have been obviated by the discovery of a siege of Babylon by the Assyrians, which occurred during Isaiah's own lifetime. On the assumption that this is correct, and bearing in mind that a Babylonian invasion of Judah is spoken of in a passage (chap. xxxix.) generally acknowledged as historical, if not Isaianic, the objections to the genuineness of the other prophecies seem to be deprived of much of their force. It is impossible fairly to summarise the points adduced on both sides in this difficult controversy. It must be admitted that the general verdict of modern scholarship is in favour (not without important

exceptions) of the view that a portion even of the first part of the book is the work of other prophets belonging to what may be called Isaiah's school.

II. The second portion of the book consists of chap. xl.-lxvi. These chapters are unquestionably written from the standpoint of the Babylonian captivity, and open with a glorious assurance of the coming redemption. The fall and captivity of Israel gave great occasion to the idolaters to maintain that their gods were superior in might to "the Holy One of Israel." Hence the majesty and power of Jehovah, and the nothingness of all the other so-called gods of the nations are constantly dwelt upon in the closing chapters. The literary style of this part of the book is often in marked contrast to the first portion, although there are remarkable coincidences between the two. The difference in style and in standpoint have led the majority of modern critics to deny that the second part can have been written by Isaiah of Jerusalem, and to maintain it to be a product of the Exilic period, though probably prior to the Restoration. Its author has been termed by Ewald "the great Unknown," and is generally designated the Deutero-Isaiah, or the Second Isaiah. If, however, Isaiah predicted the Babylonian captivity (chap. xxxix.) on the occasion of the embassy sent to Hezekiah by Merodach Baladan, it may well be argued that that prophet must have also predicted the Restoration. From the theocratic standpoint it can scarcely be conceived that a prophet should speak of the people of Jehovah being carried away into captivity without predicting a return from that captivity, on the principles enunciated in Deut.

xxx. 1-5. St. Paul, in a much darker period, predicted a day of light and deliverance (Rom. xi.).

If, however, Isaiah was the author of the second portion of the book, that portion must have been written long after his other prophecies, and towards the close of the prophet's career. He must needs have often mused on the days of exile approaching, as the shadows of apostasy gathered over the land in the opening of Manasseh's reign. When an old man, he might well have been led to transport himself in spirit to the close of that period of disgrace and sorrow. No one who actually beheld the Return of the Jews could have written in such glowing terms. The theory is not, we admit, free from difficulties Cyrus is twice mentioned by name (chap. xliv. 28, xlvi. 1) as the coming deliverer. The latter difficulty is not obviated by an appeal to the history recorded in 1 Kings xiii. 2. It is more probable that the proper names in both cases ought to be regarded as later additions. And it is conceivable that even other additions were made in the process of time to the prophecies of this part of the book.

The second portion of the book falls into three parts. (*a*) Ch. xl.-xlviii. Words of comfort to the exiles are combined with the assurance of coming restoration, mainly derived from the consideration of the essential difference between Jehovah and those who were not gods. (*b*) The great prophecy of "the Servant of Jehovah" (chap. xlix.-lvii.). The title, "Servant of Jehovah," is employed by Isaiah in a threefold sense. It is sometimes used of all Israel, "Israel according to the flesh" (chap. xlvi.).

19); more often of the godly in Israel, "Israel according to the spirit" (chap. xliv. 1, 2, 21). But in that special portion the title is used solely with reference to the Messiah, to whom the name had been also applied in chap. xlvi. 1, xlvi. 10. (c) Chap. lviii.-lxvi. describe the past sin and present salvation of Israel, and set forth the conditions under which the restoration of the people is predicted. They describe the future glory of the nation, and the overthrow of all the enemies of Jehovah. The first two sections of the second part of the book end significantly with the refrain, "no peace to the wicked," while the final destruction of the ungodly is vividly described in the closing verse of the third part.

3. The commentaries on Isaiah are very numerous. The more important are : Among the Fathers, those of Jerome and Cyril of Alexandria may be mentioned. Among the Jewish commentaries of which Latin translations exist, may be mentioned the *Comm. in Proph. post.* of Is. Abarbanel, 1520 ; Breithaupt's edition of Rashi (R. Salom. Yarchi), *Comm. in Proph. maj. et min.*, 1713 ; Dav. Kimchi, *Comm. in Jes.*, Flor., 1774 ; Ibn Ezra, *Commentary on Isaiah*; translated into English by M. Friedländer ; vols. i., ii., 1873 ; vol. iii., 1877. Important are : Strigel, *Conciones*, 1565, and Calvin, *Comm.*, 3rd edit., Genev., 1570; but more especially Vitringa's great *Comm.* in two folio volumes (Leov.), 1714, 1720 ; reprinted at Herborn, 1715, 1722. Bp. Lowth's *Comm.*, useful in its day, and often reprinted, is antiquated, and its critical and philological notes must be used with caution. The modern school of criticism on the book began with Gesenius, whose great work on the prophet was published in 3 vols. in 1820, 1821. C. L. Hendewerk, *Comm.*, in 2 vols., appeared in 1838, and a further work, *Die deuterojes. Weissagungen*, in 1843. F. W.

C. Umbreit, in *Pract. Comm.*, 2nd edit., 1846. Drechsler, *Der Prophe. Jes. übersetzt u. erklärt*, began in 1845, 1849, and was finally completed by Delitzsch and Hahn in 1854, 1857. E. Henderson, *Isaiah, with new transl. and crit. and gramm. Comm.*, 2nd edit., 1857. P. Schegg (Roman Catholic) wrote a useful commentary in 2 vols. in 1850. S. D. Luzzatto published an important commentary from the Jewish standpoint, *Il profeta Isaia*, Padua, 1855-1866. A. Knobel, in *Kurzgef. Exeg. Handb.*, 1861; revised by Diestel, 1872, and by Dillmann, *Der Prophet Jesaia erklärt*, 1890. The American scholar J. A. Alexander's *Commentary* appeared in 1846, and edit. by J. Eadie in a revised form in 1865; 2 vols. Nägelsbach, in *Länge's Bibelwerk*, 1877. J. Knabenbauer (Priest, S. J.), *Erklärung*, Freib. in B., 1881. T. K. Cheyne wrote on *Isaiah chronologically arranged* in 1870, and an important commentary entitled *The Prophecies of Isaiah*, 2 vols., 1880, 1881, 5th edit., 1889. Of Delitzsch's great commentary, the 4th revised edition appeared shortly before his lamented death in 1889. An English translation of that edit., 2 vols., has been published in 1890 by T. and T. Clark, with introduction by Driver; and an English transl. of 3rd ed. by Rev. J. Denny, B.D., has been published by Hodder and Stoughton, Lond. 1890. C. J. Bredenkamp, *Der Prophet Jesaia erläutert*, 1887. C. v. Orelli, *Die Prophe. Jesaia und Jer.*, in Strack-Zöckler's *Comm.*, 1887; v. Orelli's *Comm.* on *Isaiah* has been translated into English, T. and T. Clark, 1889. Canon Rawlinson has written on *Isaiah* in the *Pulpit Comm.*, 2 vols.

Monographs have been written on many portions of *Isaiah*, especially on Isa. lii. 13-liii. The most important of these is *The Fifty-third Chapter of Isaiah according to the Jewish Interpreters*, 2 vols.; vol. i., *Texts* by A. Neubauer; vol. ii. *Translations* by S. R. Driver and A. Neubauer, with Introduction by E. B. Pusey, 1876, 1877. W. Urwick, *The Servant of Jehovah*, a commentary, grammatical and critical, on those chapters, 1877 (see next page). R. Payne Smith, *Authenticity and Messianic Interpretation of Prophecies of Isaiah vindicated*, 1862. C. H. H. Wright, *The Pre-Christian Jewish*

Interpretation of Isaiah lii., liii., in the *Expositor*, May and June, 1888. Sir E. Strachey, *Jewish History and Politics in Times of Sargon*, 1853, 2nd ed. 1874. On the authorship the *Introductions* are most important; and C. P. Caspari, *Beiträge* on (chap. i.-vi.), 1848. The same author has written (*Ueber den Syrisch-ephraimitischen Krieg unter Jotham und Ahas*. Ein Beitrag zur Gesch. Isr. in der Assyr. Zeit u. zu den Fragen über die Glaubwürdigkeit der Chronik und den Plan des Jesaia, Christiania, 1849.) Aug. Wünsche, *Die Leiden des Messias*, 1870. Löhr, *Zur Frage über die Echtheit von Jesaias*, xl.-lxvi., 3 parts, 1878-1880. C. H. Cornill's article on *Die Composition des Buches Jesaja* in Stade's *Zeitschrift für A. T. W.*, 1884, and R. Smend's *Anmerkungen zu Jes. xxiv.-xxvii.*, are both of importance. Graetz has written on the same chapters in his *Monatschrift* for 1886. Klostermann on *Isaiah* in *Herzog-Plitt Real-Encycl.*, and F. Fehr, *Profeten Jesaja I. and II.*, Upsala, 1877, 1878. H. Guthe, *Das Zukunftsbild des Jesaia*, 1885; J. M. Rodwell's *The Proph. of Isaiah translated*, 2nd edit., 1886; S. R. Driver, *Isaiah, His Life and Times*, n. d. (1888); A. H. Sayce, *Life and Times of Isaiah*, 1889, Religious Tract Society; Dr. Forbes, *The Servant of the Lord*, T. and T. Clark, 1890, is an important work. G. F. Dalman, *Jesaia 53 m. besond. Berücksichtig. d. synag. Litteratur*, 1890. The Swedish scholar, Myrberg, has published also a commentary on the book, 1888. Of importance is the English commentary by G. A. Smith, *The Book of Isaiah*, 2 vols., in the *Expositor's Bible*, 1889. See new books in *Appendix*.

§ 3. JEREMIAH.

1. Jeremiah (יְהֹוָיְרִים) and (יְהֹוָיְרִים), Gr. Ἰερεμίας was a priest, the son of Hilkiah, who may have been the same as he who "found the book of the law in the house of the Lord" (2 Kings xxii. 8). His paternal abode was Anathoth near Jerusalem, in the territory of Benjamin. He received the prophetic call when young (chap. i. 1-7, xxv. 3), in the thirteenth year of

Josiah (B.C. 629 or 626). He prophesied in Jerusalem and the other cities of Judah (chap. xi. 6), and also in Anathoth (chap. xi. 21 ff.). After the capture of Jerusalem by the Chaldaeans, the prophet resided for a short time in Mizpah with Gedaliah, the governor of the land (chap. xl. 6); but was subsequently carried off by the insurgent Jews into Egypt (chap. xliv. 6 ff.), where he died, stoned to death, according to a late tradition, by the Jews at Tahpanhes.

2. His book consists of two parts. I. Chap. i.-xlv., which comprise prophecies concerning Judah and the kingdom of God in general, interspersed with historical narratives. II. Chap. xlvi.-li. is a separate book of prophecies concerning the nations. The last chapter (chap. lii.) is an addition by a later hand, posterior to B.C. 562. Comp. chap. li. 64 and lii. 31. Some of the prophecies were written down under Jeremiah's superintendence in the reign of Jehoiakim. The roll, however, which contained them was burnt by the king (chap. xxxvi.); and in the new edition of those prophecies large additions were made to the work (chap. xxxvi. 32). Baruch the son of Neriah was the constant friend and amanuensis of the prophet. Many of the prophecies contained in the Book of Jeremiah prove on examination not to be arranged in chronological order. The genuineness of several of the prophecies (*e.g.* chap. x. 1-16, xxv. 11-14, with portions of chap. xxvii., xxx.-xxxiii., etc.) has been often called in question, mainly on account of their resemblance to passages in the second part of Isaiah. Many portions of the work have evidently been re-edited with additional matter, and it is uncertain

at what period the prophet completed his own work. The authorship of chap. I., li. (with the exception of li. 59-64) is much disputed; but the reasons assigned are not convincing to those who believe in the reality of Divine predictions.

The text of Jeremiah in the LXX. differs considerably from that of the Hebrew. The prophecies against the nations contained in chap. xlvi.-li. are inserted in the LXX. immediately after chap. xxv. 13. In many other places the LXX. present a shorter text. The superiority of the Hebrew text is, however, generally admitted. The alterations in the LXX. seem to have been the result of design, and were not caused by the errors of copyists. The Hebrew text of the book, however, does not appear to have been well preserved.

Jeremiah was much affected by the sad and open breaches of the covenant of which Israel had been guilty, and frequently bewails the judgments which he saw would inevitably follow. He foresaw, however, the dawn of better days, which would be brought about by Israel's repentance and regeneration, and by the renewal of the covenant between Israel and Jehovah. This formed one of the great subjects of his predictions. The personality of the Messiah is not dwelt upon by Jeremiah as fully as by other prophets. But it is spoken of in chap. xxiii. 5-8, xxx. 4-11, xxxiii. 14-26. Jeremiah was frequently accused by the Jews of his day of lack of patriotism. But the accusation was false (see chap. ix.). Had the prophet's advice been followed by Zedekiah even during the siege of Jerusalem, or by the Jews after the murder of Gedaliah, the Babylonian captivity

would not have been attended with such fatal consequences to the nation.

3. The more important commentaries among the Patristic writers are those of Jerome and Theodoret. Of Reformation and post-Reformation scholars, the commentaries of Calvin Oecolampadius, Piscator may be noted. Important are Ghislerus, *Comm. in Jer. cum catena Patrum Graeorum et comm. in Lam. et Baruch*, 1623; Seb. Schmidt, *Comm. in lib. proph. Jer.*, 2 vols., 4to, 1685, and Herm. Venema, *Comm. in lib. proph. Jer.*, 2 vols., 1725. B. Blayney's *Jeremiah and Lamentations*, 1784, is now of little value. More useful is J. D. Michaelis, *Obs. phil. et crit. in Jer. vat. et Threnos*, ed. Schleusner, 1793. The writings of Hensler, 1805; Gaab, 1824; Rosenmüller; Maurer, 1833, and others are still useful. Umbreit, 1842; Ewald; Hitzig; D. Neumann, *Jeremias von Anathoth: die Weissagung. u. Klagen. ausgelegt*, 1856, 1858, suggestive but must be used with caution. K. H. Graf, *Der Prop. Jer. erkl.*, 1862, 1863; E. Meier, *Die proph. Bücher d. A. T.*, 1863; Hitzig, *Jeremiah*, 2te Aufl., 1866; Keil, *Jeremiah and Lamentations*; translated into English, T. and T. Clark; Nägelsbach on *Jeremiah* and *Lamentations* in Lange's *Bibelwerk*, 1868, English translation with addit. notes; Anton Scholz (Roman Catholic), *Der Mass. Text u. d. LXX.*, 1875; *Commentar*, 1880; Guthe, *De fœderis notione Jer.*, 1877; F. Köstlin, *Jesaja u. Jer. ihr Leben u. Werken*, 1879; Graetz, *Exeg. Studien in his Monatschrift*, 1883; R. Payne Smith in *Speaker's Commentary*; T. K. Cheyne, *Comment. on Jer. and Lam.* in *Pulpit Commentary*, 1883; also in *Jeremiah, His Life and Times*, 1888. G. C. Workman's suggestive work, *The Text of Jeremiah*, 1889, must be used with caution (see Professor Driver's critique in *Expositor*, 1889). A. W. Streane, *Commentary on Jeremiah and Lamentations* in the Cambridge Bible, 1887, is a useful work for English readers. L. A. Schneedorfer (Roman Catholic), *Das Weissagungsbuch des Prof. Jer. erkl.*, 1881, is important. C. J. Ball, *The Prophecies of Jeremiah* in *Expositor's Bible*, 1889. K. von Orelli, *Jes. and Jer.* in *Straek-Zöckler's Comm.*, 1887.

§ 4. THE LAMENTATIONS.

1. The Book of Lamentations is in Hebrew MSS. termed אֲיַכָּה (*Ah! how?*), from its first word, but generally in printed editions is styled from its contents קִנُוֹת, *Lamentations*; Gr. Θρῆνοι. In the Hebrew canon the book forms one of the five Megilloth (or *Rolls*), and is placed among the Hagiographa. It is read by the Jews on the anniversary of the destruction of the first temple (9th Ab). The book is ascribed to Jeremiah in the LXX., Targ., and Talmud. It contains five lamentations over the fall of Jerusalem. The first four poems are alphabetic. In chap. i. and chap. ii. every verse commences alike with a new letter of the Hebrew alphabet. In chap. iii. there are sixty-six verses, and every three verses begin with the same letter. In chap. i. the usual order of the alphabet is followed, in which ו precedes ס. But in chap. ii., iii., and iv., the reverse order is followed. In chap. iv. there are twenty-two verses, each of four lines; chap. v. is not alphabetic, although it has only twenty-two verses. The authorship of Jeremiah has been defended by many eminent critics, both ancient and modern. Compare the statement in 2 Chron. xxxv. 25. It must be borne in mind, however, that no remains exist of the special lamentations spoken of in that passage, although Josephus (*Antiq.*, x. 5, 1) seems to think that this book was composed on that occasion.

The LXX. prefixes the following preface to the book, "And it came to pass after Israel was taken

captive and Jerusalem was destroyed, Jeremiah sat down weeping, and lamented with this lamentation over Jerusalem, and said," etc.

2. A considerable number of those scholars who have written on the prophecies of Jeremiah have also written on the Lamentations. Among the older commentaries, J. Ternovius, *Comm. in Threnos*, 1642; J. H. Pareau, *Thren. Jer. phil. and crit. illustr.*, 1790, are of importance. Among the modern writers on the book may be mentioned Goldwitzer, *Uebersetz. mit Vergl. d. LXX. u. Vulg. u. krit. Anmerk.*, 1828 ; Kalkar, *Lam. crit. et exeg. illustr.*, 1836; O. Thenius, *Die Klagelieder*, in *Kurzgef. exeg. Handb.*, 1855 ; W. Engelhardt, *Die Klagelieder*, 1867. *Der Midrash Echa Rabbati das ist die haggad. Ausleg. der Klagelied., zum ersten Male ins Deutsche übertragen* von Dr. Aug. Wiünsche, 1881, is an important work. E. Gerlach, *Die Klagelieder*, 1868; L. A. Schneedorfer (Roman Catholic), *Die Klag. erkl.*, 1876 ; J. M. Schönfelder, *Die Klagelieder des Jeremias nach Rabbinischer Auslegung*, 1887. On the questions connected with the book, besides the various *Introductions* to the Old Testament, see Th. Nöldeke, *Alt-test. Litteratur*, 1868; C. Flöckner, *Ueber d. Verf. d. Klagel. in d. Tüb. Theol. Quartalschr.*, lix. 1877. S. Oettli, in *Strack and Zöckler's Comm.*, 1889.

§ 5. EZEKIEL.

1. The name Ezekiel, **אֱצָזְבֵּל**, is compounded either of **לַעֲזֹר**, *God is strong*, according to Ewald, or of **לַעֲזֹר**, *Him whom God strengthens*. LXX. Ἰεζεκιήλ and so Sir. xlix. 8. Vulgate *Ezechiel*. The prophet Ezekiel was the son of a priest called Buzi (which occurs as a gentilic name in Job xxxii. 2, 6). He was carried into captivity with Jehoiachin in b.c. 597 or 599, and henceforward lived and prophesied "in the

land of the Chaldaeans" by the river, or canal, of Chebar, בָּרֶכֶת, which must carefully be distinguished from Habor, חַבּוֹר, mentioned in 2 Kings xvii. 6. See Fried. Delitzsch, *Paradies*, p. 47 ff. Ezekiel began to prophesy five years after the captivity, and consequently prophesied at least twenty-two years, since his last dated prophecy was in the twenty-seventh year of the captivity. He may have, however, prophesied for a longer period. He was a contemporary of Jeremiah. The scene of Ezekiel's labours was Babylon, that of Jeremiah Palestine and Egypt. An uncertain tradition states that Ezekiel, as well as Jeremiah, was put to death by his fellow exiles on account of his denunciations of idolatry.

2. His book naturally falls into three parts:—

I. The first portion comprises chap. i.-xxiv., and consists mainly of prophecies concerning Judah and Jerusalem. The introductory section, chap. i. 1-iii. 31, is termed by the Jews "the vision of the chariot." The phrase "chariot" is used in connection with the cherubim in 1 Chron. xxviii. 18, and hence the name given to this vision in which the cherubim formed so conspicuous a feature. The "living creatures" mentioned in chap. i. are later described as cherubim (see specially chap. x. 20). II. The second portion of the book comprises chap. xxv.-xxxii. It contains prophecies against Ammon, Moab, Edom, Philistia, Tyre, Sidon, and Egypt. III. The third portion of the book is occupied with the days of Restoration and Recovery, chap. xxxiii.-xlvi. That portion, written after the judgment had fallen on Jerusalem (chap.

xxxiii. 21 ff.), abounds in remarkable promises of the future. The false shepherds and leaders of Israel are described in chap. xxxiv., and in contrast to them the Messiah is delineated as the “one shepherd,” “My servant David.” Chap. xxxv. is a prophecy against Edom, occasioned probably by the unbrotherly part acted by Edom in “the day of Jerusalem” mentioned in Ps. cxxxvii. 7. Ezekiel is particularly strong on the morality of true religion. See chap. xviii. and chap. xxxii.

3. Ezekiel delighted in allegories. Of these the most remarkable is that of Oholah and Oholibah (chap. xxiii.). The national restoration of Israel is predicted in chap. xxxvii. under the picture of a resurrection of bodies of which the dry bones alone remained. The prophecy concerning Gog and Magog (chap. xxxviii., xxxix.) is not a literal prediction, but a prophetical allegory in which the attempts of the enemies of Israel to destroy that people in their weak state after the Restoration, and Israel's final victory, are vividly described. The absurdity of regarding that prophecy to be a prediction of the future of Russia on account of the supposed, but utterly mistaken, connection between the names *Rosh* and *Russia*, *Meshech* and *Muscovy*, *Tubal* and *Tobolsk* (!!) has been exposed in my *Biblical Essays*. Similarly allegorical is the description in chap. xl.-xlviii. of the new theocracy, of the new temple erected, not in the old Jerusalem, but in an ideal city, on an “exceeding high mountain.” From the sanctuary of the new temple living waters are described as flowing downwards, and, although unfed by affluent streams, as

ever deepening along their course, until they flow into the Dead Sea and heal its waters. The new city described by Ezekiel is called "Jehovah Shammah," "*Jehovah is there.*" When from his Old Testament standpoint, Ezekiel describes the land as again divided among the tribes, he is careful to note that the strangers who shall sojourn in Israel are to have equal rights with the children of Israel themselves. The whole description is consequently allegorical, or ideal, and not literal. The visions of future blessings were described by the prophet under Old Testament forms and figures.

Some modern critics maintain, however, that Ezekiel's description of the reorganization of the priesthood and the temple services and ceremonies was intended to be taken literally. Those critics argue that the arrangements described by Ezekiel were older than those laid down in the portion of the Pentateuch termed by them "the Priests' Code" (see before, p. 89 ff.). These arguments are very doubtful, and by no means as cogent as often represented. The soundest defence against such novel views is to be found in insisting on the ideal and allegorical character of the prophecy. The genuineness of Ezekiel is admitted by all critics of mark. The Jews regarded "the vision of the chariot," *i.e.* the vision of the cherubim in chap. i. and chap. x. 9 (see before, p. 188) as a synopsis of theosophy; the first chapter of Genesis being similarly viewed as a synopsis of cosmogony. Hence the study of both those portions of Scripture was forbidden to persons under thirty years of age.

4. Among the older commentaries on this book may be mentioned those of J. Oecolampadius *Comm. in Ezech.*, 1543, folio; V. Strigelii, *Ezech. proph. ad Heb. verit. recogn. et argum. et schol. illustr.*, 1564, 1575, and 1579; Casp. Sanctii, *Comm. in Ezech. et Dan.*, 1619; Hieron. Pradi et J. Bapt. Villalpandi in *Ezech. explan. et appar. urbis et templ. Hieros. comm. illust.*, Rom., 1596-1604, 3 vols., folio; H. Venema, *Lect. Aead. ad Ezech.*, 1790. Among the newer are: Rosenmüller, *Scholia*, 2nd edit., 1826; Maurer in vol. ii. of his *Comm.*, 1836; Hävernick, *Comm. über den Proph. Ezechiel*, 1843; Ewald, in *Proph. d. alt. Bundes*, vol. 2, 2te Ausg., 1868; E. Henderson, *Ezekiel with Comm., critieal, etc.*, 1855; Kliefoth, 1864; Hengstenberg, *Die Weissagungen des Proph. Ezech.*, 2 vols, 1867, 1868, translated into English, T. and T. Clark; Patrick Fairbairn, *Ezekiel and the Book of his Prophecy, with a New Translation*, 3rd. edit., 1863. Keil, 1868, English translation published by T. and T. Clark; 2nd edit. of the German work with 4 lith. plates, 1882; F. W. J. Schröder, in Lange, 1873; F. Hitzig, *Ezekiel*, 1847, in *Kurzg. Ex. Handb.*, by R. Smend, with 8 woodcuts and plan, 1880; J. Knabenbauer (Rom. Cath.), *Comm. in Ezech.*, Paris, 1890. Very important is C. H. Cornill, *Das Buch des Proph. Ezechiel*, 1886; von Orelli, *Ezech. und Min. Proph.*, 1888, in *Strack and Zöckler's Comm.*; Ernst Kühn, *Ezechiel's Gesicht von Tempel*, Mit 1 Tafel, 1882; W. Neumann, *Die Wasser des Lebens* (Ezek. xlvi. 1-12), 1849. Important articles on *Der Brandopferaltar Ezekiels* (Ezek. xlvi. 13-17), by C. H. Cornill and R. Färber, are to be found in Luthardt's *Zeitschrift für kirch. Wissenschaft*, for the years 1883 and 1884. See *Appendix*.

§ 6. DANIEL.

1. Daniel (דָנִיֵּל) was one of the captives carried away from Judah during the reign of Jehoiakim. In addition to the facts of his personal history related in the book which bears his name, nothing more is known

of him, except that Ezekiel mentions his holy life, and places him in that respect on a par with Noah and Job (Ezek. xiv. 14-20). Ezekiel also speaks of Daniel as a paragon of wisdom (chap. xxviii. 3) in language which, though the phraseology is different, recalls in substance the statements set forth in Daniel v. 11-12, and in other places of the book. The additions to the story of Daniel in the LXX. are intrinsically of no historical value, but important as showing that many stories about Daniel, which are not contained in the Book of Daniel, were current in the centuries before Christ. Josephus does not, indeed, mention the legend of Susanna, or of Bel and the Dragon, found in the LXX., but he, too, makes additions to the history by stating that Daniel and his three companions belonged to the family of Zedekiah (*Antiq.*, x. 10, 1). Moreover he mentions additional incidents connected with the story of the den of lions (*Antiq.*, x. 11, 6), and the erection of a remarkable tower by Daniel at Ecbatane (*Antiq.*, x. 11, 7). Such legends prove Daniel to have been a well-known historical personage prior to the Grecian period. For the growth of all such legends requires considerable time. The legends concerning Daniel were multiplied in later times. There is a curious version of the story of Bel and the Dragon found in the *Midrash Bereshith* on chap. xxviii. 12, Parasha lxviii.

2. The Book of Daniel consists of two parts. I. The first contains histories connected with the life of Daniel (chap. i.-vi.). II. The second part contains four visions of Daniel (chap. vii.-xii.). The book is

written in two languages or dialects. Chap. ii. 4b-vii. inclusive is in Aramaic (miscalled Chaldee), and the rest of the book is in Hebrew. The Aramaic was probably the original language of the entire book, the Hebrew portion being only a translation from an Aramaic original. Although Aramaic may have been used as a kind of diplomatic language, it is certain that it could not have been the language spoken by the Chaldaeans, or wise men of Babylon. The adverb אֲרָמִית (chap. ii. 4), translated in the English Versions, "*in Syriac*," indicates not that the Chaldaeans addressed Nebuchadnezzar in that language, but that, from that particular place in the book onwards, the copyist, or editor of the work, quotes verbatim from an Aramaic original, of which the present Book of Daniel probably formed only a portion.

An exact parallel occurs in Ezra iv. 7, where it is said "the adversaries of Judah" wrote to the Persian king against the Jews. The remark is there made that the copy of the letter used by the compiler of that book was written אֲרָמִית, *i.e.*, in Aramaic characters, and not in the old Hebrew (see remarks on p. 17 ff.). The letter is further said to have been duly interpreted, *i.e.*, translated, although into what language is not stated. Then follows the word אֲרָמִית, indicating that Ezra iv. 8 to chap. vi. 18 was copied from original documents in Aramaic.

Although the unity of the Book of Daniel is generally conceded (see *App.*), it has the appearance rather of a series of excerpts than of a continuous narrative, and the hypothesis that the present book is an abridgment

of a larger work (partly preserved in its original language and partly translated) has much in its favour. The critics, however, are not agreed on these points. The phenomenon of a book written partly in one dialect and partly in another is also exhibited in the Book of Ezra. The fact has not been satisfactorily explained in the case of Daniel (although often attempted) by the difference in the subject-matter of the contents. The statements mentioned in chap. i. 1 cause serious difficulties, but it is somewhat hasty to conclude that those statements are incorrect; and even if incorrect, the error may be the fault of the translator.

3. Two of the more remarkable of the miracles recorded in the Book of Daniel are referred to in 1 Macc. ii. 59, 60. The book was extensively used by the author of the Book of Baruch, and by the writer of "the Epistle of Jeremiah" improperly attached to that work. The Book of Daniel is by the majority of modern critics assigned to some date between b.c. 167 and 164. But the alterations made in the text of the LXX. version, with the object of modifying passages so as to make them coincide more distinctly with the Maccabean period, tend rather to prove the Book of Daniel itself to be of earlier date. The references to Babylonian history, Babylonian names and manners, are in favour of its early composition, and some of these points have been confirmed by recent discovery. The Persian words in the book support this view, for such words would not have been used in the Greek period. On the other hand fact of Greek words occurring in the work (which

though once denied is now generally admitted by scholars) tells on the other side. The account of the Median rule is in favour of its early date, and confirmatory of the theory that the book is an abridgment of a work written by Daniel, though probably incorporating later additions. The additions seem to have been mainly inserted in chap. xi., the prophecies of which form the chief difficulties of the book. The miracles recorded in the book do not constitute its real difficulties. For if miracles ever were necessary, it was when the people of Jehovah were captives in Babylon, and the victory over Israel was looked upon as a victory over Jehovah Himself. If, however, chap. xi. xii. had been written subsequent to the overthrow of Antiochus Epiphanes, the end of that monarch would have been differently described. The phenomena alluded to point in the direction of a re-editing of the work shortly before the close of the Maccabean period. The Messianic prophecies found in the book are of special importance. It is impossible here to touch upon the evidence in favour of the book to be derived from a critical review of its prophecies. The book is alluded to by our Lord in Matt. xxiv. 15, and in other places. It lies at the base of several of the prophecies of the New Testament, especially those of the Book of Revelation. The position which Daniel occupies in the Hebrew canon, its being placed in the Hagiographa and not among the prophets, is no argument against its authenticity. Nor is the omission of Daniel's name from the list of Jesus Sirach (chap. xlix.) more remarkable than the omission there of the name of Ezra.

The writer of this *Introduction* hopes shortly to publish a commentary on Daniel in the *Pulpit Commentary*. In that commentary he intends to point out that even if the latest date assigned to the composition of the Book of Daniel were proved correct, the book displays a knowledge of the future which can only be ascribed to Divine inspiration. All attempts to make out the fourth empire of Daniel (spoken of in the dream of Nebuchadnezzar, chap. ii., and in Daniel's vision, chap. vii.) to be the kingdom of Alexander's successors have proved decided failures. The fourth kingdom can be no other than the Roman, which is described in both the passages referred to as having *two* distinct stages : (1) *an undivided stage*, in which the empire was strong as iron, and was under a central government ; (2) a *divided stage*, in which it was split up into a plurality of kingdoms, indicated by the ten toes of the image (chap. ii.) and by the ten horns of the beast (chap. vii.), which kingdoms no device or power of man, or any schemes of matrimonial alliances, could ever contrive to weld together again. It was in this weakened stage of the Roman empire that another power was to supplant some of these kingdoms, and bear general rule over the whole, but without sufficient strength to make them coalesce into one strong empire. An author, or compiler, who had the acquaintance with the past history of Babylon and Persia which is displayed in the book, could not possibly regard the rule of Antiochus Epiphanes as being in any degree whatever as powerful, still less stronger, than the empires of Babylon, Persia, or Greece.

4. The Greek version of Theodotion for a long

period did service for the LXX. version, until the latter was re-discovered in the Chigian Library at Rome, and published in 1772. The LXX. version is remarkable for many important omissions and additions. The principal apocryphal additions to the Book of Daniel consist of (a) *The Song of the Three Children*, preceded by the prayer of Azariah, found in the LXX. and Vulgate, at chap. iii. 24-90. This addition was probably composed originally in Hebrew or Aramaic. (b) *The Story of Susanna*, which in the Vulgate occurs Dan. xiii, forms in the LXX. a separate book with a title of its own. The story has received considerable additions in some of the Versions. It is devoid of any historical value, but was designed to teach a moral lesson. The Greek text is probably the original. (c) *The Story of Bel and the Dragon* forms also in the LXX. a separate book entitled "From the Prophecy of Habbakuk son of Jesus of the tribe of Levi." In the version of Theodotion that story is attached to the Book of Daniel. All these stories are fabulous, although they possess some interest.

5. The commentaries on Daniel are innumerable. On no other book, save the Book of the Revelation in the New Testament, has so much worthless matter been written in the shape of exegesis. Of the more important critical commentaries of modern days may be mentioned L. Bertholdt, *Daniel aus den Heb.-Aram. neu übersetzt u. erkl.*, 1806, 1808; v. Lengerke, *Komm.*, 1835; H. A. C. Hävernick, *Commentar*, 1832; *Neue krit. Untersuchungen*, 1838; R. Kranichfeld, *Das Buch Daniel erkl.*, 1868; Th. Kliefoth, 1868; C. F. Keil, 1869; A. Hilgenfeld, *Die Proph. Ezra und Daniel*, etc., 1863; Ph. S. Desprez, *Daniel, or the Apocalypse of the Old Testament*, 1865. E. B. Pusey, *Daniel the Prophet*, 1864; 3rd edit. 1869. Pusey's

statements as to the views of his opponents are not always reliable. Zöckler, in Lange's *Bibelwerk*, 1870, English translation; Auberlen, *Daniel u. die Offenbarung*, 1854, 2nd ed. 1887; English translation by T. and T. Clark. J. Meinholt, *Das Buch Daniel ausgelegt*, 1889, in *Strack and Zöckler's Comm.*; also his *Beiträge z. Erkl. des Buch*, 1888. Fabre d'Envien (Roman Catholic), *Le Livre du prophète Daniel*, Paris-Toulouse, 1888 (2 vols). Highly interesting is the *Commentary on the Book of Daniel* by Jephet Ibn Ali, the Karaite, edited and translated by Prof. D. S. Margoliouth, in the *Anec. Oxon.*, 1889.

Besides the above, the following are important. (1) In favour of the authenticity: Hengstenberg's *Beiträge*, 1831, translated into English, T. and T. Clark; S. P. Tregelles, *Defence of Authenticity*, 1852; J. M. Fuller, *Essay on the Authenticity of Book of Daniel*, 1864; and his commentary in *Speaker's Commentary*, 1875, 1888; W. Volck, *Vindiciae Danielicæ*, 1866; C. P. Caspari, *Zur Einführung in das Buch Daniel*, 1869; F. Lenormant, *Les sciences occultes en Asie*, 1874 [on Dan. i.-vi.]; R. Payne Smith, *Expos. of the Hist. Portion of the Writings of Daniel*, 1886. (2) Against the authenticity: F. Bleek, *Ueber Verf. u. Zweck des B. Dan.*, in the *Berl. Theol. Zeitschrift*, iii.; T. K. Cheyne's article in *Encyclopædia Brit.*, 9th edit.; R. Smend, *Jüd. Apocalyptic* in Stade's *Zeitschrift*, 1885; H. G. Kirms, *Comm. hist. critica*, 1828.

There are many important monographs on portions. G. S. Faber, *The Seventy Weeks*, 1811; E. Schrader, *Die Sage vom Wahnsinn Nebuch.* in the *Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.*, 1881; C. H. Cornill, *Die siebzig Jahrwoche*, 1889; F. Fraidl, *Die Exegese der siebzig Wochen Daniels in der alten u. mittleren Zeit*, Graz, 1883; Th. Nöldeke, on Dan. v. 25 ff. in the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, Nov. 1886, and G. Hoffmann in the same journal for 1887; J. Meinholt, *Beiträgen, zur Erklärung des B. Daniel*, 1888; van Lennep, *De zeventig Jaarweken van Daniel*, 1888.

CHAPTER XVI.

B. THE TWELVE MINOR PROPHETS.

BESIDES the commentaries noticed, pp. 172-3, on the prophets in general, the following special commentaries are of importance : Ribera, *Comm. in libr. duod. Proph.*, 1590 ; J. Calvin, *Prælect. in Duodecim Proph. Min.*, Geneva, 1610 ; Casp. Sanctii, *Comm. in duodec. proph. min.*, 1621 ; J. Drusii, *Comm.*, 1627 ; J. Schmidt, 1685, 1687, 1689 ; J. Tarnovius, *Comm. in proph. min.*, c. præf. J. B. Carpzov, 1688, 1706 ; J. Marck, *Comm. in Proph. Min.*, 4 vols., 4to, 1696-1701, and 1734 folio ; J. D. Dathe, 3rd edit., 1790 ; G. L. Bauer, *Dic kl. Proph.*, 1786, 1790 ; P. Schegg (Roman Catholic), *Die kl. Proph. übers. u. erkl.*, 2 vols., 1854, 1862 ; J. A. Theiner (Rom. Cath.), 1828, fifth part of his *Comm. über die heilige Schrift. der A. T.* ; E. Henderson, *The Minor Prophets*, translated with comm. crit., phil. and exeg., 1845, 2nd ed. 1858 ; Hitzig, 3te Aufl., 1863, 4te Aufl., edit. by Steiner, 1881 ; Keil, 3te Aufl., 1888 ; Bishop Wordsworth, 1875 ; E. B. Pusey, *The Minor Prophets, with a comm. explan. and pract.*, 1877 ; Knabenbauer (Rom. Cath.), *Comm. in proph. min.*, Paris, 1886 ; K. von Orelli, see p. 191 ; Archdeacon Farrar's *Lives and Times of the Minor Prophets* in Nisbet's series of *Men of the Bible*, 1890, deserves notice. In Lange's *Bibelwerk* the writers are : O. Schmoller on *Hosea, Joel, and Amos*, 1872 ; P. Kleinert on *Obadiah to Zephaniah*, 1876 ; J. P. Lange on *Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi*, 1876. In the English, or rather American, edition there are considerable additions by American scholars. The post-exilian prophets are commented on in that edition : *Haggai*, by J. E. McCurdy ; T. W. Chambers, *Zechariah* ; J. Packard, *Malachi*, 1874. In

the *Speaker's Commentary*, Ezekiel to Malachi compose one volume, 1876, Preb. Huxtable has there written on *Hosea* and *Jonah*; R. Gandell on *Amos*, *Nahum*, and *Zephaniah*; F. Meyrick on *Joel*, and on *Obadiah*; S. Clark on *Micah*; F. C. Cook on *Habakkuk*; W. Drake on *Haggai*, *Zechariah*, and *Malachi*. Principal Douglas, of Free Ch. Coll., Glasgow, has written on *The Six Intermediate Minor Prophets* (*i.e.*, Obadiah to Zephaniah), in T. and T. Clark's series of *Handbooks*, 1890.

a. THE NINE PRE-EXILIAN PROPHETS.

§ 1. HOSEA.

1. Hosea, הֹשֵׁה, *salvation*, Gr. Ὁσηές, was the son of Beeri, of whom nothing is known. He prophesied, like Isaiah, according to chap. i. 1, under Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, Hezekiah, and during a portion of the reign of Jeroboam II., king of Israel, whose reign in part synchronised with that of Uzziah. The Book of Hosea, being the longest, is placed first among the minor prophets, which are in the Hebrew canon regarded as forming together one book. He was a member of the northern kingdom of Israel, and prophesied somewhat later than Amos, with whose prophecies he seems to have been acquainted. Comp. Hosea iv. 3 with Amos viii. 8; and Hosea viii. 14, the phraseology of the latter part of which verse occurs seven times in Amos i. 4-ii. 5. The superscription (Hosea i. 1) causes some difficulty, because no allusion is made in the book to the Assyrian invasions which occurred during the reigns of the kings there mentioned. The superscription, however, may have been appended by a later editor.

2. The Book of Hosea consists of two portions, probably written at different periods of the prophet's life. I. Chap. i.-iii. describe the infidelity of Israel to God and God's longsuffering and enduring love. The personal history of the prophet's own life seems here employed in an allegorical manner. The woman with whom Hosea was led by Providence (like Samson in Judges xiv. 1-4) to ally himself in marriage, proved unfaithful to her marriage vow, and had to be divorced. Under a Divine leading, the prophet was led to take her back from her life of sin, and restore her to her former position. He relates the story of his own domestic trials as a picture on the one hand of Israel's faithlessness towards Jehovah, and on the other of the everlasting love manifested by Israel's God. This appears to be the truest and simplest interpretation of the difficulties in the opening chapters, and is that adopted by the best modern critics. II. The second portion of the book (chap. iv.-xiv.) sets forth the guilt of Israel in general, the sins of both priests and people (chap. iv.-viii.), the punishment coming upon Israel (chap. ix.-xi.), and the readiness of Jehovah, notwithstanding the sin of His people, to receive them graciously when penitent, and to pour a blessing on them (chap. xii.-xiv.).

3. The unity of the book is unquestioned. Its language is peculiarly difficult, and it is often hard to comprehend the prophet's meaning. The first part is written in prose, the second in poetry. The latter chapters of the book appear to have been composed at very different times, and were probably put together at the close of the prophet's life.

4. The following are the most important commentaries on the book : D. Pareus, *Comm. illust. cum transl. trip. ex Heb. et Chald.*, etc., 1605 ; Seb. Schmidt, *Comm.*, 1687 ; H. v. d. Hardt, 1703 ; J. H. Manger, *Comm. in Hoseam*, 1786 ; *Annot. hist. exeg. in Hos.*, auct. L. J. Uhland, 1785-1797. Ed. Po-cocke's English *Commentary on Hosea* is the largest and most important of the older commentaries. It was first published in 1685, and is given in his *Works*, along with his Commentary on Joel, Micah, and Malachi, 2 vols., folio, 1740. Of the more modern, besides those mentioned on p. 199 are : Schröder, *Die Proph. Hos., Joel, Amos*, 1829 ; A. Simson, *Der Proph. Hos. erkl. u. übersetzt.*, 1851 ; A. Wünsche, *Der Proph. Hos. übers. u. erkl. mit Benutzung der Targ. u. der jüd. Ausleger*, 1868, specially important for the Jewish interpretations ; W. Nowack, *Der Proph. Hos. erk.*, 1880 ; Anton. Scholz (Roman Catholic), *Comm. z. Buche des Proph. Hos.*, 1882 ; T. K. Cheyne, *Hosea, with Notes and Introduction*, 1884, Cambridge Bible for Schools, an improved edition in 1889, small, but important. Points connected with the book are discussed in Hengstenberg's *Christology*, and in Hoffmann's *Weissagung u. Erfüllung*. See also Franz Delitzsch, *Hosea u. sein Weissagungsbuch*, in the Erlangen *Zeitschr. für Prot. u. Kirche*, 1854 ; Kurtz, *Die Ehe des Proph. Hos.*, 1859 ; Redslob, *Die Integrität d. Stelle Hos. vii. 4-10 in Frage gestellt*, 1842 ; A. H. Sayce, *Book of Hosea in the Light of Assyrian Research*, in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, for 1889.

§ 2. JOEL.

1. Joel, יְהוָיֵל, whose God is Jehovah, LXX. Ἰωηλ, was the son of Pethuel, and prophesied in Judah and Jerusalem. Owing to his peculiar mention of the priests, he may have been a priest-prophet ; but little more can be learned about him or his family. As there is no allusion in his prophecies to a king of Judah, and he addresses himself chiefly to the elders,

it has been conjectured that he prophesied during the long minority of king Jehoash of Judah (2 Kings xii.). The enemies of Judah spoken of in his prophecies are Tyre and Sidon, along with the Philistines, who had sold Jewish captives into the hands of the Greeks. Egypt and Edom are also mentioned in the book; but not a word is spoken concerning Assyria or Babylon, or of the later enemies of Israel. Hence, though some have endeavoured to assign the book to as late a period as the Maccabean times, the grounds for doing so are very insufficient. The locusts described by Joel have been often supposed to be allegorical of the northern foes. But the language of chap. ii. in general (see ver. 4, etc.) is more naturally interpreted of an actual plague of locusts and other devouring insects (see specially ver. 25). The book consists mainly of one grand oration, comprising: (I.) a lamentation and call to repentance (chap. i. 1-ii. 17); (II.) with, in the second part, the result of prayer, and a description of the blessings of the future (chap. ii. 18-end). The latter portion contains passages which refer to the Messianic days. The final struggle of good and evil is represented allegorically as taking place at Jerusalem, in the valley of Jehoshaphat, where the conclusive victory is gained, and Judah is delivered from her foes. The language employed does not admit of literal interpretation. Most remarkable is Joel's prophecy of the outpouring of the Spirit referred to in the New Testament.

2. Joel, in its style and character of its contents, is one of the most remarkable of the books of the

Old Testament. The pre-exilian date of the book, with certain variations in detail, is defended by Hengstenberg, Hävernick, Credner, Movers in *Bibl. Chronologie*, 1834; Hitzig; Ewald; Hoffmann in *Weissagung u. Erfüllung*; Knobel, *Prophetismus*, 1837; Delitzsch, in *Luth. Zeitschrift*, 1851; Wünsche; Schrader in de Wette's *Einleitung*. Others, as Schröder and Kuenen, *Prophets and Prophecy*, consider it to have been written shortly before the exile. Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift f. wissensch. Theol.*, x., Vatke, in his *Einleitung*, and Ad. Merx assign it to the post-exilian period, after B.C. 445.

3. Besides the commentaries noted p. 173 and p. 199, the following are of importance:—J. Leusden, *Joel explic. in quo text. Ebr. per paraphr. Chald., Mas. magn. et parv., perque trium præstantiss. Rabb. Jarchi, Aben Ezr. and D. Kimchi comm., etc., cui in fine adj. est Obadias eodem fere modo illust.*, 1657; C. Hasæi, *Prop. Joelis*, 1697. Among the moderns are A. Svanborg, *Joel, Lat. versus et notis phil. illustr.*, Upsala, 1806; Holzhausen, 1829; Credner, 1831; E. Meier, 1841; A. Wünsche, *Die Weissagungen des Prop. J. übers. u. erkl.*, 1872; J. A. Karle, *Joel ben Pethuel propheta comm.*, 1877; Ad. Merx., *Die Prop. des Joel und ihre Ausleger*, etc., beigegeb. ist der Aethiopische Text des Joel bearb. von Prof. Dr. A. Dillmann, 1879. This work is specially important for its valuable history of interpreters from the earliest times to the Reformation. A. Scholz (Rom. Cath.), *Comm. z. Buche des proph. Joel*, 1885; G. Preuss, *Die Prophetie Joel*, 1889. Important is the work of an American scholar, W. L. Pearson, *The Prophecy of Joel: its unity, its aim, and the date of its comp.*, Leipzig, 1885. Later still, and in favour of a post-exilic date, is H. Holzinger, *Sprachcharacter und Auffassungszeit des Buches Joel*, in *Zeitschrift für A. T. Wissenschaft*, 1889. Solacee A. B. Davidson in *Expositor*, March, 1888;

S. Oettli, *Der Prophet Joel, Vortrag*, 1888; Eugène la Savoureaux, *Le prophète Joel: introduction critique, traduction et comm.*, 1888.

§ 3. AMOS.

1. Amos (**אָמוֹס**, *burden*, Gr. Ἀμώς), was a shepherd or herdman of Tekoa, five miles south of Bethlehem, and ten distant from Jerusalem. He was originally a dresser of sycamore or fig-mulberry trees. He prophesied in the days of Uzziah and of Jeroboam II., and was somewhat earlier than Isaiah, and a contemporary of Hosea. Amid the successes of Jeroboam II. he prophesied of coming judgment and defeat. He visited the northern kingdom, and carried on his prophetic work there. Amaziah, the priest of Bethel, grossly exaggerated the meaning of the prophecies of Amos (chap. vii. 10-17), and sought to stir up Jeroboam II., king of Israel, against him. But the prophet boldly continued his work, relying on his Divine commission. Chap. i. and ii. announce judgment upon the nations, upon Syria, Philistia, Tyre, Edom, Moab, Judah, and Israel. Chap. iii.-vi. contain prophecies concerning Israel. Chap. vii.-ix. 10 give a series of visions indicative of coming judgment. The book closes with promises of future blessings (chap. ix. 11-15).

2. See, as before, pp. 173, 199. Among other commentaries may be mentioned: J. Gerhardi, *Adn. posth. in Proph. Amos et Jon.*, 1676; J. C. Harenberg, *Amos proph. exposit.*, 1763; L. J. Uhland, *Annot ad loca quæd. Am.*, 1779; J. S. Vater, *Amos übers. u erkl.* 1810; G. Baur, *Der Prophet Amos erkl.*,

1847; G. Hoffmann, *Versuche zu Amos* in *Zeitschrift für die A. T. Wissenschaft*, 1883. See A. B. Davidson in *Expositor*, March and September, 1887.

§ 4. OBADIAH.

1. The name of Obadiah (**עֹבֶד יְהוָה**, *worshipper of Jehovah*, Gr. Ὁβαδίας, Ἀβδίας) is very common. The Book of Obadiah is directed against Edom. There is much uncertainty as to the time in which it was written, and as to the events to which it refers. Many clauses contained in verses 1-9 are found verbatim in the Book of Jeremiah (chap. xlix. 7-22), so that the question arises which prophet is to be regarded as the original? If Jeremiah quoted from Obadiah, then the prophecy of the latter may have been as early as the reign of Jehoram king of Judah, when, after the revolt of Edom from Judah, Jerusalem was sacked by the united Philistines and Arabians (2 Chron. xxi. 16, 17). It is quite possible that the Edomites may then have acted as related in verses 11-14. In favour of the early date of the prophecy, it is urged that no mention is made of Assyria or Babylon, and moreover Obadiah ver. 17 is closely akin to Joel iii. 5. On the other hand, it has been urged: (a) that if Jeremiah had the prophecy of Obadiah before him, he would probably have quoted more than its opening portion; and (b) that Ps. cxxxvii. 7 sheds light on Obad. 11-14. But these arguments are not decisive. It is quite possible that both Obadiah and Jeremiah quoted from some earlier prophecy. On the whole, the arguments in

favour of the early date of Obadiah seem to be the stronger. But the matter is by no means certain.

2. The wildest legends exist with regard to Obadiah, such as that he was identical with the Obadiah who was over Ahab's household (1 Kings xviii.). So Josephus and the Talmud. He has also been identified with the captain of fifty spared by Elijah (2 Kings i. 13); or supposed to have been a converted Edomite, or the husband of the widow-woman of Zarephath mentioned 1 Kings xvii. Among the special commentaries on the book that of Leusden has been mentioned on p. 204; Aug. Pfeiffer, *Comm.*, 1660; J. G. Schröer, 1766; C. F. Schnurrer, *Dissert. phil. in Obad.*, 1787; H. A. Grimm, *Jonæ et Obad. orac. Syriacc*, ed. Duisburg, 1799; Venema, *Lectt. in Ob.*, with additions in Verschuir, *Opusc.*, 1810; L. Hendewerck, *Obadj. orac. in Idumæos*, 1836; C. P. Caspari, *Der prophet Obadja*, 1842, is of special importance; W. Seydel, *Vaticin. Obad. sec. text. Heb. et Chald.*, etc., 1869; R. F. Weidner, *Studies in Obadiah in the Lutheran Church Review*, Oct. 1887 (American). See also pp. 173, 199 ff.

§ 5. JONAH.

Jonah, (יֹנָה, *dove*, Gr. Ἰωνᾶς) the son of Amittai mentioned in this book is no doubt identical with the prophet of the name who lived in the days of Jeroboam II. (2 Kings xiv. 25). If the book was actually written by Jonah it would be the earliest book of prophecy in the Sacred Records. The Book of Jonah, however, nowhere claims to have been written by that prophet. Its history is never referred to in any one of the canonical writings of the Old Testament. Jonah is, however, mentioned among the minor prophets in 2 Esdras (4th Esdras) i. 40, but

chap. i. and ii. of that book are well-known to be additions by a later hand to a book which is in itself of very questionable antiquity (see p. 139). Two references to Jonah's prophecy concerning Nineveh occur in Tobit xiv. 4, 8, where his prophecy is spoken of as still awaiting fulfilment. The story of Jonah in the whale's belly is referred to as historical in 3 Macc. vi. 8, and by Josephus, *Antiq.*, ix. 10, 2. Orthodox critics have generally regarded the narrative as history, on account of the references to it in the New Testament. If the book had been regarded as an historical narrative when the Hebrew canon was arranged, it would, however, scarcely have been inserted among the prophetic books, or have been placed among them in the order in which it now stands.

The difficulties in the way of regarding the work as historical are serious. Apart from the marvels related in the story, the utter silence of the Hebrew Scriptures in reference to the supposed history is most unaccountable. Jonah himself was unquestionably an historical personage (2 Kings xiv. 25). The conversion of the Ninevites at the preaching of Jonah, if historical fact, casts into the shade all the other events recorded from the days of Moses to the Restoration. Not one of the prophets who speak of Assyria contain the slightest allusion to an event which in itself would have placed Nineveh's guilt in the darkest light. Most of the orthodox commentators have felt the latter difficulty, and accordingly have assumed the conversion of the Ninevites to have been merely a transient incident.

It has also been tacitly assumed that our Lord

viewed the narrative as historical fact. But such a conclusion is inconsistent with the references to the story in Luke xi. 29 ff.; Matt. xii. 39 ff. The repentance of the Ninevites is not referred to by Christ as a merely transient movement, but as a great fact, the fruits of which are yet to be manifested in the day of judgment to the confusion of the men of Christ's own generation. The book itself does not give any countenance to the idea that the conversion of the Ninevites was a mere passing wave of popular feeling. If it were only such, it might be asked how did it differ essentially from the conversion of the thousands of the men of our Lord's generation who, under temporary conviction of sin, were "baptized with the baptism of repentance" under the preaching of John the Baptist? But if the repentance of "Nineveh, that great city," was indeed an historical fact, if its people indeed repented of their murders, their sorceries, their idolatry, fornication, and thefts (comp. Rev. ix. 21), on what principle is the silence about such a remarkable fact of the Book of Kings, and the silence of such prophets as Isaiah, Jeremiah, Nahum, Zephaniah, to be accounted for? Every one of our Lord's references to the Book of Jonah harmonises with the theory that the book was a book of prophecy, a prophetic parable, in which by the repentant Ninevites those Gentiles were represented—and they were not few in number (comp. Esther viii. 17)—who in the days of Israel's exile beheld the wonders wrought by Jehovah in their midst, and "turned unto God from idols to serve a living and true God." Whatever theory of the book

be correct, our Lord could have referred to it in no other way than He did. The New Testament references decide nothing, except that the book is in some way or other a book of prophecy. Consequently, the question whether the book is also historical must be decided from internal evidence alone.

If the book be a prophetic parable, or (as Kleinert styles it) a historico-symbolical prophecy, the place it occupies in the Hebrew canon is most appropriate. The Divine inspiration and grandeur of the book become then more apparent, and all the difficulties connected with it completely vanish. Israel is suitably represented in such a prophetic allegory by the prophet Jonah, for Jonah was one of the earliest of the prophets. Israel "could only be properly represented in an allegory by a prophet, and only by a prophet who (owing to the incidents of his personal history being unknown) might without violence to actual history form a leading character in such a divinely-constructed parable." The allegory depicts the history of Israel, and under it the history of the Messiah, just as the title "servant of Jehovah" is used of Israel generally, then of the faithful in Israel, and lastly of the Messiah. See p. 179.

The critics who have denied the historical character of the book have usually regarded it as (1) purely legendary, or (2) as containing legends resting on some slight basis of fact, or (3) as wholly fictitious, depending for its importance solely on its moral or religious teaching. The view which regards it as a prophetic-historical allegory is entirely different, and quite consistent with a belief in the Divine inspiration and

authority of the book. According to the latter theory, Jonah represents Israel fleeing from the duty imposed on the nation in its prophetic character as a witness for God. The sleep of Jonah, the storm on the sea, Jonah's bold confession of faith when aroused from slumber, admit of easy explanation. The world-power is actually represented in the prophets as a sea-monster (see Isa. xxvii.; Jer. li. 34). That sea-monster is represented as, in the person of Nebuchadnezzar, swallowing up Israel (li. 34). Bel, the god of Babylon, is forced to disgorge his prey (li. 44). Israel's duration in exile is represented by Hosea as lasting for "three days" (Hosea vi. 2). The prayer of Jonah in the fish's belly (chap. iii., compare Israel in the maw of Nebuchadnezzar in Jer. li. 34) is made up of a number of sentences taken from Psalms composed during the Exile. The language even of vv. 5, 6 (the only original verses in that poem) contains phrases elsewhere used in reference to Exilic times, or to the deliverance from Egypt as recorded in Exodus. See the ordinary marginal references in the English Bibles. The "prayer" of Jonah contains no confession of sin, and no petition for deliverance. Such facts are highly significant. They are very serious difficulties in the way of the literal explanation; they fall in exactly with the allegorical. No part of that "prayer" can be regarded as descriptive of a man actually located in a fish's belly.

The second portion of the Book of Jonah, when viewed as a prophetical allegory, is even more remarkable than the first. The closing portion of it, and the mode in which the narrative is suddenly broken off,

are remarkably analogous to the second part of our Lord's great parable (Luke xv. 25-32). Viewed in this light the Book of Jonah is seen to contain several important predictions of Messianic times, inclusive of the prophecy of our Lord's resurrection referred to in the New Testament. Even if the incidents related in the Book of Jonah could be proved to be historical in the ordinary sense of that term, the importance of those incidents is mainly dependent upon their allegorical or prophetic character; as are, also, those facts of Abrahamic history allegorized by St. Paul in Gal. iv. 21-31. The Book of Jonah is mainly important as a book of prophecy.

2. The above is condensed from the essay on "The Book of Jonah considered from an allegorical point of view" in my *Biblical Essays* (T. and T. Clark, 1886). The first helpful suggestions on the point were derived from J. S. Bloch's *Studien zur Geschichte der Sammlung der alt-hebräische Literatur*, Leipzig, 1875, which reached a second edition in 1882. Paul Kleinert, a most orthodox theologian, adopts substantially the same view in Lange's *Bibelwerk*, although it is not brought out with sufficient clearness; and Professor Elliott, the American scholar, who has translated and enlarged Kleinert's commentary in the English edition, makes a gentle protest against the theory. T. K. Cheyne has in the *Theological Review* (1877) partly supported the allegorical view, although he holds partly to the myth theory. The allegorical view has been very differently presented by Herm. von der Hardt in his *Aenigmata prisca orbis*, 1723, and in other writings; by Gottfr. Less in his *Vermischte Schriften*, i. 1782; by A. W. Krahmer in his *Hist. krit. Untersuchung in Schriftforscher*, Part i., 1839; by K. C. Palmer in Scheerer's *Archiv*, 1801; and by Friedr. Bergman in his *Jonah eine alt. Test. Parabel*, 1885. The number of commentaries written on the book,

independently of those noted on the Minor Prophets in general (p. 199), is very large. Leusden's *Jonas illust. per paraph. Chald., Raschi, Ibn Ezra*, etc., 1656 and 1692, is still useful. Fredrichsen, *Krit. Uebers. d. versch. Ansichten*, 2te Aufl., 1842. Prof. W. Wright's *Jonah in Chald., Syr., Aeth., and Arab., with corresp. glossaries*, 1857, is useful for students. The literature on the book is given in the English edition of Lange's *Bibelwerk*, and more largely in M. M. Kalisch's *Bible Studies*, Part ii., *The Book of Jonah*, 1878, whose critical and philological remarks are important. Kalisch, however, has strangely not noticed Bloch's *Studien*, nor the remarks of Kleinert in his Introduction to the book. The strength of the objections to the historical view cannot be understood by those who only read such commentaries as those of Pusey in his *Minor Prophets*, Huxtable in the *Speaker's Commentary*, or R. A. Redford's *Studies in the Book of Jonah*, 1883. Suggestive from the same point of view, although ignoring all the critical difficulties, is Dr. H. Martin, *The Prophet Jonah, his Character and Mission to Nineveh*, 2nd edit., Edin., 1877; W. Böhme, *Die Composition des Buches Jona* in the *Zeitschrift für die alt-test. Wissenschaft*, 1887, attempts, not very successfully, to prove that the book is a composition of various writers—Jahvist, Elohist—and editors. Archdeacon Perowne's little commentary in the *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges* contains many good remarks, but has not grasped “the other side” of the question.

§ 6. MICAH.

1. Micah, מִיכָּה, a shortened form of מִיכָּהוּ, Who is like Jehovah? Compare מַיְצָאֵל, Michael, who is like God? The LXX. transliterate it *Mixaias*. It is exactly the same name as that borne by the prophet who lived in the days of Ahab, spoken of in 1 Kings xxii. 8-28. The author of the book was of Moreshath-

Gath (chap. i. 14), which belonged to Judah, and prophesied, according to chap. i. 1, under Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah. The book falls into three parts. I. Chap. i., ii. describe the judgments which were to fall on Israel and Judah on account of their sin. That prophecy closes with a prediction of recovery from exile (chap. ii. 12, 13). II. Chap. iii.-v. describe vividly the sin of the people and their punishment in striking connection with a grand Messianic prophecy. III. Chap. vi.-vii. contain exhortations to repentance and warnings. Voices of penitence are admirably intermingled in those chapters with assurances of salvation. Some modern critics maintain that the portions chap. iv. 9-14 and chap. vii. 7-20 are later insertions; but the reasons adduced do not justify the conclusion. Ewald considers chap. vi. and vii. to have been composed by another prophet in the reign of Manasseh. Stade maintains that only chap. i.-iii. (exclusive of chap. ii. 12, 13) can have been written by Micah. Reuss considers almost the whole book to be genuine.

Much discussion has arisen whether Micah iv. 1-4 is the original of Isa. ii. 2-4, or *vice versa*, or whether both prophets have quoted from some earlier prediction. Eminent critics have argued on all the three sides. The prophecy of Micah iii. 12 is distinctly quoted in Jer. xxvi. 18. The most remarkable prophecy of the book is that of the birth of the Messiah at Bethlehem (chap. v. 2, 3), which is of still more importance when viewed in relation to the context in which it is found. Very important, too, are the prophet's references to Gen. iii. in chap. vii. 17; to the history

of the patriarchs in chap. vii. 20 ; to the exodus, and to the story of Balaam in chap. vi. 4, 6.

2. The best commentaries, in addition to those mentioned p. 199, are those of Ed. Pococke, *Commentary on Micah and Malachi*, 1677, or in his *Works*, 1740. C. F. Schnurrer and J. G. Andler, *Animadv. phil. crit. ad vatic. M. ex coll. vers. Graec. reliquarumq. in Polygl. Lond. edit.*, 1783. G. L. Bauer, *Animadv. crit. in duo priora proph. M. capp.*, 1790. C. P. Caspari, *Ueber Micha den Morasth. u. seine proph. Schrift.*, Christiania, 1852 ; T. Roorda, *Comm. in vat. Michæ*, 1869. A. Thomas, *Essai sur le Proph. Michée*, Geneva, 1853 ; L. Baulme, *Les Prophéties de Mich.*, Toulouse, 1866. See also Hengstenberg, *Christology*, vid. p. 173. Reinke (Roman Catholic), *Der Prophet Micha*, 1874. T. K. Cheyne, *Micah, with Notes and Introd.*, 1882, 2nd edit. B. Stade, in *Zeitschrift f. d. alt-test. Wissenschaft*, 1881, 1883. V. Ryssel, *Untersuchungen über d. Textgestalt u. d. Echtheit des Buches Micha. Ein krit. commentar zu Micha* is most important, 1887. W. Nowack, in Stade's *Zeitschrift*, 1884. See *Appendix*.

§ 7. NAHUM.

1. Nahum, נָחוּם, rich in comfort, Gr. Ναούμ, belonged to Elkosh, a village not yet identified, though probably belonging to Galilee. There are many different opinions on the meaning of Elkosh. The identification with Alkush near Mosul is connected with a tradition which cannot be traced back earlier than the sixteenth century. The town in question is in all probability of much later origin than the time of Nahum. His short book, which is occupied wholly with "the burden of Nineveh," "the bloody city" (chap. iii. 1), probably goes back to B.C. 660. For the destruction of No-amon (Thebes in Egypt), which is spoken of as a recent event (chap. iii. 8 ff.),

was accomplished by Assurbanipal, king of Assyria, in B.C. 664 or 663. The descriptions given by Nahum are exceedingly fine and vivid, and the book is deservedly classed among the finest productions of Old Testament literature.

2. The special commentaries on the book are numerous, and the literature connected with the overthrow and fall of Nineveh of great extent. Among the commentaries may be mentioned : C. F. Stäudlin, *Hosea, Nahum und Habakkuk neu übersetzt und erläutert*, 1786. *Vatic. Nah. observat. phil. illustr.* Diss. præs. M. C. M. Agrell, resp. N. S. Colliander, Upsala, 1788. H. A. Grimm, *Nah. neu übersetzt m. erkl. Anm.*, 1790. J. Bodin, *Nah. lat. vers. et notis phil. illust.*, Upsala, 1806. O. Strauss, *Nahumi de Nine Vat. expl. ex Assyr. monum. illust.*, 1853. C. A. Blomquist, Upsala, 1853. F. Gihl, Upsala, 1860. Vance Smith, *Prophecies relating to Nineveh and the Assyrians*, 1857. M. Breiteneicher, *Nin. u. Nahum*, 1861. L. Reinke (Rom. Cath.), *Kritik der alten Versionen des Nah.*, 1867, E. Mahler, *Untersuchungen im Buche Nahum auf den Untergang Nin. bezogenen Finsterniss*, mit 2 Karten, Wien, 1886, aus *Sitzungsbericht d. k. Acad. d. Wiss.* See also p. 199.

§ 8. HABAKKUK.

1. Habakkuk, הָבָקָעַ, LXX. Ἀμβακούμ, was a member of the kingdom of Judah, is termed a prophet in chap. i. 1, and was possibly, as Delitzsch supposes, one of the Temple-singers, as his poem or prayer (chap. iii.) was intended for temple use (chap. iii. 19). According to the superscription of the apocryphal "Bel and the Dragon" in the Chigian Codex of the LXX. he was "of the tribe of Levi," the prophet being identified from the similarity of name with the Habakkuk mentioned in the end of that piece, who in the text of Theodotion is termed "Habbacuc the

prophet in Judaea" (see Fritzsche, *Lib. Apoc. V. T. Graece*). Other legends need not here be mentioned. His date is uncertain. Delitzsch supposes him to have lived in the reign of Josiah, because Zephaniah (i. 7) seems to quote Hab. ii. 20, and Jeremiah (iv. 13 and v. 6) appears to quote Hab. i. 8. Most other critics consider the prophet to have prophesied in the early part of Jehoiakim's reign. He prophesied about the Chaldaean invasion. The book is semi-dramatic. Chap. i. contains Habakkuk's complaint (ver. 2-4), and Jehovah's reply (ver. 5-11) with the prophet's comment thereupon (ver. 12-17). In the second chapter the prophet sets himself on the watch-tower, and obtains a reply promising the ultimate destruction of the foe, whenever the special work which that enemy was raised up to perform should have been accomplished. The grand poem of chap. iii. describes a Divine theophany, in which the past glories connected with the redemption of Israel from Egyptian bondage are dwelt upon, in order to encourage the righteous to stay upon their God in the sore days of trouble and trial which were then at hand.

2. The Rabbinical commentary on Habakkuk by Abarbanel has been translated into Latin by Sprecher, 1709, and that of R. Tanchum has been edited by S. Munk, *Comm. sur le livre de Hab.*, 1843. Of the later critical commentaries may be mentioned: Stäudlin, *Hosea, Nah., und Hab. neu übers. u. erkl.*, 1786. Wahl, *Hab. neu übers. mit Einl.*, etc., 1790; B. P. Kofod, *Chab. ratic. comm. crit. atque eweg.*, 1792. Wolff, *Der Proph. Hab.*, 1822. Bäumlein, *Comm. de Hab. ratic.*, 1840 Especially Franz Delitzsch, *De Habb. Proph. vita atque ætate*, etc., 1842, and *Der Proph. Habakuk ausgelegt*, 1843. Gumpach, *Der Proph. Hab.*, 1860; and Reinke (Roman Catholic), *Der*

Proph. Hab., 1870. Ant. J. Baumgartner, *Le prophète Habakkuk, Introduction critique et exégèse*, Leipzig, 1885. R. Sinker, *The Psalm of Habakkuk*, a revised translation, with critical and exegetical notes, 1890. See also the writers on Minor Prophets, p. 199.

§ 9. ZEPHANIAH.

1. Zephaniah, זֶפְנַיָּה (Jehovah hides, or protects), LXX. Σοφορίας, was probably a great-grandson of Hezekiah the king (chap. i. 1), although the omission of the phrase “the king” in that passage has caused some difficulty to critics. He lived in the reign of Josiah prior to the great reformation accomplished by that king (comp. chap. i. 4-6 and chap. iii. 1-5). He vividly depicts a great day of wrath coming on Judah and the kingdoms round about, as well as upon Assyria and Ethiopia. He promises, however, Messianic blessings to the remnant of Israel, which is to be purified by affliction and brought back from captivity. He moreover predicted that the same blessings would be bestowed also upon the nations of the earth. It has been supposed by some critics that the prophecies of Zephaniah refer to the Scythian inroads upon Judah, but that view cannot be sustained. The Babylonian invasion is evidently that predicted, although the reports of the Scythian barbarities probably gave a special tinge to the predictions. The Messianic age is vividly depicted, although the Messiah Himself is not distinctly alluded to. Jehovah is, however, represented as the king of Israel “in the midst of His people” (chap. iii. 15), in language which shows that the Messianic

prophecies of Isaiah (ix. 5, xii. 6) were well remembered and referred to. There are other remarkable references to Isaiah in the last portion of chap. iii. Compare ver. 9 with Isa. vi. 5, ver. 10 with Isa. xviii. 1. Compare also ver. 10, 11—correctly translated on the margin of the Revised Version—with Isa. lxvi. 20, which reference might be adduced as an argument for the unity of the Book of Isaiah.

2. Martin Bucer wrote a commentary on Zephaniah in 1528⁹ which is still of value. Besides the writers on the Minor Prophets mentioned p. 199, the most important in connection with Zephaniah are : Cramer, *Scyth. Denkmäler in Palæstina*, 1777. D. von Coelln, *Spicil. observ. exeg. crit. in Zeph.*, 1818. Herwig in Bengel's *Archiv*, Band i.; E. Ewald, *Übers. mit Anmerk.*, 1827. F. A. Strauss, *Vaticinia Zeph. comm. illustr.*, 1843. V. S. Johnson, Upsala, 1857; L. Reinke (Roman Catholic), *Der Proph. Zeph.*, 1868. Friedr. Schwally, *Das Buch Ssefanjā, eine hist.-kritische Untersuchung*, in the *Zeitschrift f. A. T. Wissenschaft*, 1890.

b. THE POST-EXILIAN PROPHETS.

§ 10. HAGGAI.

1. Haggai ('אַיִל, *Festal*, Gr. Ἀγγαῖος, probably born on some great festal day), was one of those who returned from captivity with the first band of Israelites, under the leadership of Zerubbabel. The prophecies contained in the book were all delivered within the space of some three months. Short as they were, they were the means of stirring up Zerubbabel and Joshua to go forward with the work of re-building the Temple, which, though begun in the second year of Cyrus, B.C. 535, had, owing to opposition, been abandoned in despair (Ezra iv. v.). The

impetus given by his prophecies, and those of Zechariah, to that work is mentioned by Ezra (chap. v. 1, vi. 14). Ewald conjectures, from Haggai ii. 3, that Haggai was one of the old men who had seen the first temple in its glory; but the passage does not fully warrant such a conclusion. Haggai's prophecies contained in this book are four in number, and are distinguished for their brevity. The passage in chap. ii. 6-9 is Messianic, and is referred to in Heb. xii. 26-28. It is incorrect to regard the phrase in ver. 7, translated in the Authorised Version "the desire of all nations," as a title of the Messiah. The correct translation is "the desirable things of all nations" (Revised Version), which is abundantly proved from the fact that the verb in the clause ("shall come") is in the plural. "The desirable things" spoken of were the silver and the gold required for the use of the temple. But "the latter glory" of that second temple, in which alone it outshone the former in glory, was that it was the place in which the manifestation of the Messiah actually occurred, and that epiphany is the event by which the prophecy of Haggai was finally accomplished.

2. Many of the commentaries on Haggai deal also with the two other post-exilian prophets, Zechariah and Malachi, as, for instance, the Latin commentaries of F. Baldwin, 1610; Willius, 1638; Varenius, 1662. Among the later commentaries on these three prophets are those of W. Pressel, 1860; T. V. Moore, *The Prophets Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi*, New York, 1856; Aug. Köhler, *Die nachexilische Propheten, Haggai*, 1860; *Sacharja*, 1861; *Malachi*, 1865; Reinke, *Der Proph. Haggai*, 1868; J. P. Lange in his *Bibelwerk*, 1876. In the English translation of Lange's *Bibelwerk*, in place of J. P. Lange's

own commentary on these books (which appeared subsequently to the American edition), the Book of Haggai is expounded by J. F. McCurdy, the Book of Zechariah by T. W. Chambers, and the Book of Malachi by J. Packard.

On Haggai, among the commentaries in Latin are the *Scholia* of J. Mercer, which appeared in 1551; the commentary of Grynæus in 1581; Reinbeck's *Exercit. in proph. Hagg.*, 1692; D. Pfeffinger, *Notæ*, 1703; Woken, *Annot. exeg.*, 1719; N. Hesslen, *Vatic. Hagg.*, Lund. 1699. The passage in Hagg. ii. 6-9 is discussed in Hengstenberg's *Christology*, Hofmann's *Weissagung u. Erfüllung*, J. P. Smith's *Scripture Testimony to the Messiah*, and a number of smaller monographs.

§ 11. ZECHARIAH.

Zechariah (יהִנֵּם, *Jehovah remembers*, LXX. *Zaxarias*) is styled in chap. i. 1 the son of Berechiah, the son of Iddo. The latter was one of the priests who returned with Zerubbabel and Joshua (Neh. xii. 4, 16; Ezra v. 1, vi. 14). The Book of Zechariah is divided into two portions. I. The first consists of chap. i.-viii., the genuineness of which is undisputed. This portion contains (*a*) an exhortation to repentance (chap. i. 1-6), followed by (*b*) seven apocalyptic visions, sometimes counted as eight, for the sixth has two parts. These visions, like those of the Book of the Revelation (comp. Rev. i. 19), delineate the past and the present, as well as the future. 1. The vision of the *Angelic Riders*, which is accompanied by a partial explanation (chap. i. 7-17). 2. That of the *Four Horns*, and of the *Four Smiths*, raised up to put an end to the destructive power of the horns (chap. i. 18-21). 3. That of the *Man with the Measuring-line*, which is followed by the Angel's address to the prophet (chap. ii.) 4. *The*

High Priest Joshua before the Angel; the accusation of Satan; the rebuke of the Adversary; the restoration of Joshua to favour, and the adjuration of him by the Angel (chap. iii.) 5. *The Vision of the Golden Candlestick*, with its explanation (chap. iv.). 6. *The Vision of the Flying Roll*, with the curse written on both sides, and of *the Woman in the Ephah* symbolising Wickedness and her instruments, with her temporary rescue from destruction (chap. v.). 7. *The Vision of the Four Chariots*. That vision is evidently based upon Daniel's vision of the four empires, and is incidentally evidence of the genuineness of the Book of Daniel (chap. vi. 1-8). The Seven Visions are followed (c) by a remarkable description of the crowning of the High Priest, indicating symbolically the crowning of Messiah, the Branch, as Priest and King (chap. vi. 9-15). Next follow (d) chap. vii., viii., which narrate how a deputation came from Bethel to inquire about fasts (chap. vii. 1-7), an account which is succeeded by two comforting discourses delivered by the prophet.

II. The second part of the book (chap. ix.-xiv.) has been the subject of much critical controversy. Many critics maintain that the second portion is composed of prophecies belonging to different periods, and by different authors, which have been appended to the Book of Zechariah. Chap. ix.-xi., with chap. xiii. 7-9, are supposed by some to have been written prior to the Exile by a contemporary of Isaiah. Chap. xii.-xiv. (with the omission of chap. xiii. 7-9) are supposed by these critics to have been written by a contemporary of Jeremiah. Other critics, however, maintain that the whole of the latter

portion of Zechariah is post-exilic, even if written by a different prophet. The arguments in favour of the genuineness and unity of the book overweigh in our opinion those adduced on the other side. The historical references in the early portion of the latter part of the book do not correspond with the events of pre-exilic days. The chapters in question depict rather the judgments which actually fell on various portions of Syria and Palestine during the Grecian period, and led to the absorption of the residue of the Philistines into the body politic of Israel. Those judgments helped to prepare the way for the Messiah, who is depicted by the prophet as coming in lowly guise. The Maccabean period is the subject-matter of a considerable portion of these prophecies. Chap. x. describes the war of the sons of Zion against Greece, although the old prophetic symbols of Assyria and Egypt are made use of at the close of that prophecy. Chap. xi., xii. refer also to the same period, the outlines of which epoch are sketched down to the coming of the Messiah and to His rejection by the people of Israel. The vivid description of the mourning in chap. xii. is most remarkable. All families are described as mourning; wives, husbands, each "apart" from one another in Jerusalem and throughout the land. The frequent repetition of the idea of each individual mourning "apart" indicates that point to be the chief feature in the picture. The mourning is different from that described in Ezek. vii. 16-18, 27, and, though inconceivable as an actual literal fact, has been realised in that individual penitential mourning for Christ on the part

of all believers in Him which is still in process of fulfilment. Chap. xiii. strikingly depicts the reaction against false prophets in the post-exilic period, which ultimately led to the rejection of the true Prophet of Israel. The closing chapter of the book (chap. xiv.) contains passages which are highly apocalyptic, and were never designed to be understood literally. It depicts rather "the last things as seen in the light of the Old Testament." The Messianic passages in chap. ix., xi., xii. and xiii. are of the highest importance.

2. The literature on the Book of Zechariah is very extensive. Besides the works noted pp. 173, 199, Philip Melanchthon, *Comm. in proph. Zach.*, *Opera*, ii., Grynæus (1581), Calvin (1610), J. H. Ursinus (1652), and others of the Reformers wrote learned commentaries on the book, as did Vitrunga (1734), Venema (1789), etc. Blayney's *Commentary*, 1797, is almost antiquated. Of the more modern may be mentioned Köster, *Meletemata crit. et exeg. in Zach. partem poster.*, 1818. Forberg, on the same portion, also in Latin, 1824. Hengstenberg on the *Integrity of Zechariah*, 1831, has been translated into English (T. and T. Clark). F. Burger, *Études exégétiques et critiques*, 1841. Bleek, *Das Zeitalter von Sacharja*, in the *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1852. M. Baumgarten, 1854. Monographs by Sandrock in defence of the unity, 1856; by von Ortenberg against it, 1859. W. Neumann, 1860; Kliefoth, 1862; Köhler, p. 220. C. H. H. Wright, *Bampton Lectures on Zechariah and his prophecies, with crit. and gram. comm.*, 1879. Bredenkamp, *Der Proph. Sach.*, 1879, was published simultaneously. W. H. Lowe, *The Hebrew Student's Commentary on Zechariah*, 1882. B. Stade, *Deuterozacharja, eine kritische Studie*, in the *Zeitschrift für die alt-test. Wissenschaft*, 1881 and 1882. Of the Rabbinical writers, *David Kimchi's Comm. on Zech.*, translated from the Hebrew, has been edited, with

notes, by Alex. McCaul, 1837 ; and the *Yalkut on Zechariah*, translated, with notes and appendix, by E. G. King, 1882. *The Post-exilian Prophets*, by Marcus Dods, 1879. *Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi*, by Ven. T. T. Perowne, in Cambridge Bible for Schools, 1886-1889. W. Lindsay Alexander, *Zechariah, his Visions and Warnings*, 1885. T. K. Cheyne, *Origin of Book of Zechariah in Jewish Quarterly Review*, Oct., 1888. The commentary of Bosanquet, and many other such like, are utterly worthless. (See *Appendix*.)

§ 12. MALACHI.

1. Nothing whatever is known respecting the history or person of Malachi. The name מֶלֶךְ would naturally signify “*my angel*,” as in chap. iii. 1. It is, however, quite possible to render it with Gesenius and Winer, by *angelicus*—i.e. one standing in some connection with an angel. Hence some of the ancients derived the fancy that these prophecies were delivered by angelic hands; while others regarded the word as a name of office, *my messenger*. Jonathan ben Uzziel in the Targum accordingly supposes Ezra the scribe to have been referred to. The LXX. in the superscription regard the word as a proper name, Μαλαχίας; but in the text (chap. i. 1) they render the word ἐν χειρὶ ἀγγέλου αὐτοῦ. The name מֶלֶךְ was in all probability a curtailed form, מֶלֶךְיָהוּ or מֶלֶךְיָה. It is probable that Malachi was a contemporary of Nehemiah, and prophesied between the period of that governor's first and second residence in Judæa. Compare the reference in chap. i. 8 with Neh. v. 14. The circumstances noted in Neh. xiii. correspond with the indications given in the Book of Malachi. The prophet denounces the presentation of inferior victims on the

altar, the looseness in matrimonial relations, and the spirit of indifference on the part of the priests, all of which indicated a sad falling off in religious fervour. In a portion of the book the dialogue form is made use of. The announcement of the coming of the Messiah in judgment preceded by His forerunner (chap. iii. 1, iv. 1, 2) is one of the most remarkable prophecies of the book. Elijah, the prophet here spoken of, was declared by our Lord to be John the Baptist (Matt. xi. 14, xvii. 10-13; Mark ix. 11-13) although some have strangely maintained, in spite of those distinct declarations, that a future advent of Elijah the prophet is to be looked for. The Divine character of the Messiah is not obscurely hinted at in chap. iii. 1. The attempts of Romish theologians to twist chap. i. 11 and chap. iii. 4 into predictions of "the sacrifice of the mass" will deceive no one who is acquainted with the fact that Old Testament prophecies of the future are depicted in the light, and with the symbols, of the Old Testament.

2. On the literature of the book consult pp. 173, 199. Dav. Chyträus, *Explic. Mal.*, 1568; J. J. Grynæus, *Hypomnemata in Mal.*, 1582; latest edition 1612. S. Bohlius, *Mal. Prophe. cum comm. Rabbinorum*, 1637. J. H. Ursinus, *Comm.*, 1652. J. Wessel, *Malach. enucleatus*, 1729. Ed. Pococke's *Commentary on the Prophecy of Malachi*, in his *Works*, 1740, is valuable. H. Venema. *Compl. ad lib. Mal.*, 1763. C. F. Bahrdt, 1768. Reinke (Rom. Cath.), *Der Prophe. Malachi*, 1856. A. Köhler, see p. 220. Marcus Dods, in T. and T. Clark's *Handbooks for Bible Classes*, and T. T. Perowne, in the *Cambridge Bible*, have given useful commentaries on Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi.

APPENDIX

THE Cairo MSS., mentioned p. 21, have been recently examined by Prof. Ad. Merx, who has informed me that the dates given in the text are those found in the epigraphs in the MSS.

Page 7. The 3rd edition of Ewald's *History of the People of Israel* was translated into English by J. Estlin Carpenter, who was the editor of the volumes composing the Old Test. portion. The other volumes were edited by J. F. Smith. The 4th edition has been translated by Prof. R. Martineau, and of this edition vols. i. and ii. appeared in 1883.

Page 8. The Germ. transl. of Kuenen's work by Weber is a translation of the second edition, while the French transl. by Dr. Pierson was made from the first edition. The two editions are considerably different, for Kuenen when he published his first edition had not embraced Graf's views. See addition to p. 95 in this Appendix.

Page 8. Fr. Buhl, who has been called from Copenhagen to Leipzig to fill the chair left vacant by the death of Prof. Franz Delitzsch, has published an important work, *Kanon u. Text des Alt. Test.*, Leipzig 1891, 262 pp., 8vo.

Page 28. The Hebrew-English Lexicon (mentioned in the Preface, p. xi) by Professors Driver, Briggs, and Brown, is now in the press, and will probably be issued in parts. The German scholars, Professors Stade of Giessen and C. Siegfried of Jena, have also in the press a new *Heb. Wörterbuch*, which is expected to be completed next year (1892).

Page 33. The difficult question here alluded to—namely, the prohibition to commit to writing anything except the Holy Scriptures—will be found discussed more in detail in Strack's *Einleitung in den Thalmud*, Leipzig, 1887, pp. 38 ff. Such prohibitions, although generally attended to, may, it is obvious, not have been always observed.

Page 34. Dr. Ludwig Blau's *Masoretische Untersuchungen*, Strassburg 1891, reviewed by Dr. Ad. Neubauer in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, April 1891, with P. de Lagarde's *Das älteste Glied d. mass. Traditionskette*, in the *Göttingen Nachricht.*, 1890, p. 95 ff., are important new contributions to the Massorah literature.

Page 35. The word קרי was by the old scholars always pointed קרי (K'ri), and regarded as a participle passive. But Luzzatto has pointed out that that vocalization, though the most general, is incorrect, because the word is really a preterite, and therefore should be pointed קרֵ (K'rē). See Luzzatto, *Gramm. der bibl.-chald. Sprache*, p. 32 note, and Kautzsch, *Gramm. der bibl.-Aram.*, p. 81 note.

Page 54. An English translation of Schürer's important work on the *History of the Jewish People in the time of Jesus Christ* has now been published by T. and T. Clark.

Page 55. Graetz, in a short article contributed to the *Jewish Quarterly Review* for Oct. 1890, pp. 150-156, gives reasons, based on internal evidence, why the LXX. could not have been composed prior to Maccabean times, although it could not have been made much later. But his arguments would be quite consistent with the theory of a revision about that time of the Greek version which was then in use. Prof. Swete of Cambridge has replied to Graetz in the *Expository Times* of June 1891.

Page 57. Attention ought to have been drawn, among the works which have appeared on the several books of the LXX. translation, to Hatch's important lecture "On Origen's Revision of the LXX. Text of Job," in his *Essays in Biblical Greek*,

Oxford 1889. B. Jacob's article, "Das Buch Esther bei den LXX.", in Stade's *Zeitschrift für die alt-test. Wissenschaft* for 1890, will be found referred to in our remarks on the literature of the Book of Esther (p. 146), but ought also to have been noticed here.

Page 95. It ought to be observed here that Prof. Kuenen not only defended Graf's hypothesis, when generally rejected by scholars, but developed it further, placing it on a firmer basis by getting rid of the difficulty with which Graf had encumbered that theory. For Graf maintained that what is now designated "the Priestly Code" consisted of two parts,—the narrative portion by "the older Elohist," which was extremely ancient, and the legislative portion, which belonged, according to his view, to the post-exilian period. Kuenen, however, maintains that those two portions really belong to one work, and are the latest parts of the Pentateuch. Wellhausen's views have been largely influenced by Kuenen, although the former scholar has shown much originality in the historical application of the theory.

Page 98. The exception to this statement is that the ridge-pole of the tabernacle is not distinctly mentioned; nor is the mode explained by which that ridge-pole, or the ridge-rope used in its stead, was supported and kept from drooping in the centre. The old pictures, which represent the roof of the tabernacle with its outer covering of skins as flat, have long since been shown to be misleading. See Fergusson's article on the Tabernacle and Temple in *Smith's Bible Dictionary*.

Page 102. Many new contributions on the critical questions connected with the Pentateuch have since appeared, such as R. B. Girdlestone's *Foundations of the Bible: Studies in Old Test. Criticism* (London 1890); Klostermann, *Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Pent.* I. "Der Grund-fehler aller heutigen Pentateuchkritik" in the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift* for 1890, Hefte 9 and 10; C. G. Montefiore, "Recent Criticism upon Moses and the Pent. narratives of the Decalogue," in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* for Jan. 1891. In the same review will be found Prof. Grätz on "The Central Sanctuary

of Deuteronomy," and A. Kohut's "*Parsic and Jewish Literature of the First Man.*" C. H. Cornill has contributed the first of his *Beiträge zur Pentateuchkritik*, on Gen. xxxiv., to Stade's *Zeitschrift*, Heft. I. for 1891. Important is H. Brugsch, *Die biblischen Sieben Jahre der Hungersnoth nach dem Wortlaut e altägypt. Felsen-Inschrift.* Leipzig, 1891, mit 32 autogr. Taf. u. 5 Holzschn.

Page 103. See on *Ewald*, additional note to p. 7 in this Appendix. A first vol. of an English translation of Renan's *Hist. du Peuple d'Israël*, giving the history up to the capture of Samaria, appeared in 1889 (Chapman and Hall).

Page 109. Among the additions to the literature of Genesis, besides the "Zweite vielfach verbesserte Auflage" of Kautzsch and Socin's *Genesis mit äusserer Unterscheidung der Quellschriften*, 1891, may be mentioned: O. Naumann, *Das erste Buch der Bibel, mit seiner inneren Einheit u. Echtheit dargestellt*, Gütersloh, 1890; Th. Nöldeke's short article, "Der Paradiesfluss Gihon in Arabien?" in the *Zeitschrift der Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft*, Heft IV. for 1890. Professor Kautzsch has, in combination with other eminent scholars, begun a critical translation of the Old Test., in which the various documents are specially noted. The first three parts, comprehending the Hexateuch, are now published. Freiburg in B., 1890, 1891.

Page 121. To the literature on Joshua should be added Em. Albers, *Die Quellenberichte in Josh. i.—xii. Beitrag zur Quellenkritik des Hexateuchs*, Bonn, 1891. Under the literature illustrative of the Book of Joshua might be mentioned the recent contributions to the geography of Palestine, which are all important in connexion with the thorough criticism of that book. Want of space, however, has forbidden our entering on such a prolific subject.

Page 146. Scholz has written on the names which occur in the Book of Esther, in *Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1890, and Zimmern on the origin of the Feast of Purim in Stade's *Zeitschrift* for 1891.

Page 152. To the literature of the book of Job must be added the important work of Prof. Johann Georg Ernst Hoffmann, *Hiob*, Kiel, 1891. This small treatise of only 106 pages contains an introduction, translation, and short critical notes. Hoffmann assigns Job to a postexilic date. Prof. Cheyne has already reviewed Hoffmann in the *Critical Review*, May 1891. J. Grill has also written *Zur Kritik der Composition des Buches Hiob*, 1890.

Page 159. A very handy and useful book for the general student acquainted with German is *Die Psalmen: Hebraischer Text mit einer kurzen Auslegung*. Nach Dr. Aug. Heiligstedt's Tode fortgesetzt und zu Ende geführt von Dr. Max Budie. Halle, 1888. Prof. Kirkpatrick has published vol. i. of the Psalms (Ps. i.—xli.) in the Cambridge Bible, 1891.

Page 163. Mr. R. F. Horton's work on the *Book of Proverbs*, in the *Expositor's Bible*, 1891, is a valuable contribution to exegesis.

Page 167. Among the newer contributions to the literature of Ecclesiastes are: W. Volck in *Die poet. Hagiographa*, in *Strack and Zöckler's Comm.*, 1889; the work of the Swedish Professor, O. F. Myrberg, *Predikareboken översatt och förklared*, Stockholm, 1889; A. Lods, *L'Ecclesiaste et la Philosophie grecque*, Paris, 1890.

Page 182. On Isaiah of importance are: J. Barth, *Beiträge zur Erklärung des Jesaia*, 1885; F. Giesebricht, *Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik: nebst einer Studie über prophetische Schriftstellerei*, Göttingen, 1890; B. Blake, B.D., *How to read Isaiah, being the Prophecies of Isaiah arranged in order*, T. & T. Clark, 1891.

Page 191. On Ezekiel, Professor L. Gautier of Lausanne has published *La Mission du Prophète Ézéchiel*, Lausanne, 1891; and E. Selle, *De Aramaismis libri Ezechieles*, Halle, 1890.

Page 198. Among the monographs on Daniel may be included the following: *Fulfilled Prophecy, a proof of the Truth of Revealed Religion*; being the Warburtonian Lectures for 1854-1858; with an Appendix of Notes, including a full

investigation of Daniel's Prophecy of the Seventy Weeks. By the Very Rev. W. Goode, D.D., F.S.A., Dean of Ripon. Second edition. Edited by the Rev. E. W. Bullinger, D.D., 1890 ; also A. Bludau, *De Alex. interp. lib. Dan. indec. crit. et herm. Pars I.* Münster in W. 1891. Knabenbauer has just issued a *Comm. in Daniel proph. Lam. et Baruch*, Paris 1891, pp. 520.

Page 215. A critical work of value has been published on Micah by an English scholar : *The Massoretic Text and the Ancient Versions of the Book of Micah*. By John Taylor, M.A., Dr. Litt. (Lond.). Williams and Norgate, 1891.

Page 225. Professor H. Graetz has written in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* for January 1891 on "The Last Chapter of Zechariah." Whatever Graetz writes deserves attention, although we cannot adopt his views as to the interpretation of the chapter in question. Prof. George Hoffmann of Kiel has, in his *Hiob*, noticed at p. 230, some important remarks on Zechariah and its relation to that book. Hoffmann has expressed himself decidedly in favour of the unity of Zechariah.

THE END.

BS1171 .W94 1891
An introduction to the Old Testament

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00047 7721